

DEC 3 19

TWO

DISCOURSES

ON

PROPHECY:

WITH

AN APPENDIX

IN WHICH MR. MILLER'S SCHEME, CONCERNING OUR LORD'S
SECOND ADVENT, IS CONSIDERED AND REFUTED.

BY SAMUEL FARMAR JARVIS, D.D., LL.D.

JAMES WHITE LIBRARY

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY

BERRIEN SPRINGS, MICHIGAN 49104

Rarely to be the author of a false interpretation of Scripture, is to take God's
name in vain, in a high degree.

S. D. A. THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
TAKOMA PARK, WASHINGTON, D. C.

NEW YORK:

PUBLISHED BY JAMES A. SPARKS,

No. 109 Nassau Street,

1843.

76051

22
139

Entered according to the act of Congress, in the year 1843, by
JAMES A. SPARKS,
in the Clerk's office of the District Court for the Southern District of New York.

Vavit

BS

647

J37

RM C

HER.

S. W. BENEDICT & CO., PRINT.,

128 Fulton street.

BX

6124

J37

TO THE HONORABLE JAMES KENT, LL.D.,

FORMERLY CHANCELLOR OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK.

MY DEAR SIR,

You doubtless have forgotten, though I never can forget, your words to me in 1836, when you passed a morning in my library at Washington College, in Hartford. After declaring that it was the pleasantest day you had spent during your journey, you added: "But do you know what a load of responsibility the possession of these books lays upon you? You are bound to make known the treasures they contain, to your countrymen." Your words dwelt on my memory, animated my exertions, and cheered me in the midst of toil and trouble. And though circumstances have long prevented my giving to the public any fruits of my labors, yet I have been constantly at work, and am now prepared to begin a series of publications. This little volume may be considered as the first fruits. To whom can I dedicate it with more propriety than to you? I hope you will do me the favor to accept the offering, small though it be, as a feeble tribute of that respect for your exalted character, and that admiration of your profound learning, with which I have the honor to remain,

Your grateful friend,

and faithful servant,

THE AUTHOR.

MIDDLETOWN, CONNECTICUT,
June, 1843.

P R E F A C E .

THE AUTHOR of these Discourses has been, for the last three or four years, engaged in preparing for the press his introductory volume of Ecclesiastical History ; and in order to adjust the dates of the birth and death of our Lord Jesus Christ, he has been led to go rather largely into an examination of ancient chronology. It is for this reason probably, that during the excitement occasioned by the writings of Mr. Miller, and the preaching of himself and his followers, on the second advent, the author has been often asked for his opinion concerning the calculations which have produced such extraordinary results. He was very unwilling to go into the subject, for two reasons: first, because it would necessarily, for a time, divert his thoughts from the principal subject of his meditations ; and secondly, because the unerring hand of HIM who, with regard to the future as well as the past, is his own interpreter, would soon allay the ferment. But his reserve and caution were misinterpreted. Much to his surprise he learned, by letters from various quarters, that Mr. Miller's preachers had made use of his name, and had asserted, to use their own language, that he "agreed with Mr. Miller in believing that the visions of Daniel ran out in 1843." He owed it, therefore, to himself, and to the church whose servant he is, publicly to contradict the calumny. He did this,

in the first instance, in a letter to the Rev. D. G. Tomlinson, printed in the Church Chronicle and Record of February 24, 1843, and thence copied into the Churchman in April last. The two discourses now published were delivered, by request, first at Middletown and Portland in Connecticut in March, and subsequently, by request also, in the Church of the Annunciation, and St. Paul's and St. John's Chapels, in New York, on the second and ninth of April; soon after which the author was requested to publish them. He was unwilling to appear before the public as the antagonist of a short-lived sect; and he therefore complied with the request, only on the condition of having time allowed him, to prepare an Appendix on the chronological difficulties to which reference was made. The labor which this has cost him will not be regretted, if it preserves his book from that oblivion to which the mere correction of Mr. Miller's errors would shortly consign it.

In the Appendix, as the reader will perceive, a system of Chronology is formed which differs, in some respects, from that by which the author was governed in the examination of Mr. Miller's theory. He trusts that the analysis there given will sufficiently explain his reasons for the change. But it may not be equally obvious why he did not, in publishing the Sermons, alter the chronology so as to adapt it to the following part of his work. It will be seen, too, that, in speaking of the curtailment of the reign of Jehoram the son of Jehoshaphat from *eight* to *five* years, and the introduction of *eleven* years of interregnum between the reigns of Amaziah and Uzziah, he has censured Mr. Miller in too unmeasured terms. These particulars he is bound to explain.

It would certainly have been easier, and perhaps more advantageous to the author, to have made the alterations

silently, and omitted the censure. But would it have been equally HONEST ?

In preparing the Introductory volume of his Ecclesiastical History, he had carefully avoided reading modern writers on chronology, for fear of being biassed by their systems. For this reason he had never read the learned work of Dr. Hales ; and though familiar with Petavius, Usher, and Marsham, a good while had elapsed since he had consulted them on the parts of history connected with the prophecies. But these great writers being entirely silent as to any interregnum in the kingdom of Judah, the existence of such an interregnum was entirely a new idea to him. Mr. Miller quoted 2 Kings xiv., xv., without mentioning the verses from which he drew the inference ; and it was not till the author had read Dr. Hales' Analysis, that he saw the correctness of that inference. If this admission gives Mr. Miller any advantage he is fairly entitled to it. We cannot for one moment suppose that he knew anything about Dr. Hales or his work. As a plain unlettered man, his perspicuity in reading his Bible, and *his Bible only*, is much to his credit ; and we ought to consider it as giving additional force to the reasons assigned by Dr. Hales, that an ignorant man, as Mr. Miller confessedly is, should, from the mere examination of the Bible, have arrived at the same conclusion. The censure, however, in the sermon, holds good with regard to the reign of Jehoram, the son of Jehoshaphat, 2 Kings viii. 17, 2 Chron. xxi. 5 ; but being equally applicable to Archbishop Usher, should not have been laid particularly at Mr. Miller's door. A departure from the Bible is to be condemned, whether the author of such departure be learned or unlearned. Mr. Miller was misled, probably, by the marginal notes in both places inserted by Bishop Lloyd, doubtless on the Arch-

bishop's authority, that Jehoram reigned "in consort with his father." But this is said without any authority from the sacred text; and it only increases the difficulty of synchronizing the first period of the kings of Judah from Rehoboam to Ahaziah the son of Jehoram, with that of the kings of Israel, if the period be made less than 95 years. This, upon examination, will be obvious.

The author must not conclude without observing that the greater part of the Appendix having been written during his absence from home, he could not, till his return, consult the original text and the several versions of 2 Kings xiv. 17, 23, xv. 1., 2 Chron. xxv. 25, to see if any various readings in the Hebrew text, or any difference as to numbers in the ancient translations, might be found affecting the subject. He therefore mentions here, for the satisfaction of the English reader, that there are no such diversities; and consequently we must, on the authority of these passages, admit that there was a minority of eleven years, between the fifteenth and the twenty-seventh years of Jeroboam II. of Israel occurring in Judah, between the sole reigns of Amaziah and Azariah or Uzziah.

S. F. J.

MIDDLETOWN, CONNECTICUT,

June, 1843.

“Nihil ut facilius, ita tolerandum minus est, quàm in antiquissimos scriptores erroris nostri culpam inscitiaeque transferre. E contrario verò nihil aut consultius aut magis optandum est quam ut veterum auctoritati fideique tribuamus plurimum: nec ab eâ, nisi evidentissimis planeque necessariis veritatis indiciis admoniti convictique recedamus.”—*Petavius de Doctrinâ Temporum, Lib. x. c. 2.*

Nothing is easier, or less to be tolerated, than to transfer the fault of our own error and ignorance to ancient writers. On the other hand, nothing is more wise or more ardently to be desired, than to pay the highest deference to their authority and fidelity, and never to recede from that authority, unless admonished and convinced by the most evident and plainly necessary indications of truth.

SERMON I.

2 PETER, i. 19, 20, 21.

“ We have also a more sure word of prophecy ; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day-star arise in your hearts : Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man : but holy men of God spake *as they were* moved by the Holy Ghost.”

THE second Epistle of St. Peter was probably written at Rome after the death of St. Paul, and certainly a very short time before his own. This he expressly declares in the 14th verse of this chapter, in assigning the motives for his writing. It was written therefore in the latter part of the reign of Nero, and not more than four years before the destruction of Jerusalem. It was addressed to the same Christian communities to whom he had sent his first Epistle ; namely, to the Jewish Christians scattered in the Provinces of Asia Minor, lying along the Euxine or Black Sea. The object of it was, to give them, and through them, all the members of God's Church till the end of time, his dying charge to make their calling and election sure, and to prepare, by the practice of all the Christian gifts and graces, for the second coming of their Lord.

Some have supposed, from the time in which the Apostle wrote, that when he spake of "the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ," he meant to indicate merely the approaching termination of the Jewish Commonwealth. But though he may have had that event in view as the beginning of those judgments which are to overtake all the enemies of Christ, yet it is much more consonant with the purposes for which revelation was given, and more consistent with the whole tenor of Scripture, to believe that his ultimate scope was the visible and personal appearing of our Lord in glory. I cannot conceive that anything short of this was consistent with the long duration, the gradual progress, and the wide extent of the Mediatorial kingdom. As a dying man, therefore, writing not for the men of that age alone, but for the whole Church, even to the time of the Second Advent, the Apostle solemnly declares the truth of his own testimony. He could not be deceived himself, and he could not and would not deceive the Church of God. "We have not followed cunningly-devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye-witnesses of his majesty,"*—namely, the majesty, as the two following verses show, which the Apostle himself saw on the holy mount of the transfiguration.

If it be asked what connection that glorious vision had with the second coming of the Lord Jesus, we answer that it took place exactly one year before the kindred glories of the Ascension; that it was designed to prepare the minds of his disciples, not only for his death, but for his resurrection and return to his ante-

* 2 Peter, i. 16.

mundane glory ; and that to Peter, in common with all who witnessed the ascension, the angelic testimony was given, that the "same Jesus" would "so come in like manner as" they had "seen him go into heaven."*

His personal testimony as to the manner and majesty of our Lord's second coming being thus given, the Apostle proceeds, in the language of the text, to present another argument on the same subject of a most exalted and convincing nature. It is no less than this, that the Spirit of God hath spoken of that glorious event "by the mouth of his holy prophets."† "We have also," he says, "a most sure prophetic word to which ye do well to give earnest attention." He compares it to a lamp which burneth in the squalid darkness (for that is the meaning of the term) of the present life ; and he assigns two reasons why all Christians should give such earnest heed to it. The first is, because, in the language of our translation, we know "that no prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation." The second is, that prophecy did not proceed from human will, but from the motions of the Holy Ghost.

The words "private interpretation" in the English Bible, are in some measure of doubtful meaning, and have therefore been the occasion of controversy. The word rendered "private" literally signifies "*that which belongs to one's self—one's own* ;" and the word rendered "interpretation" is a figure derived from the loosing or untying of a knot. Literally translated therefore, the expression means that Prophecy is *not of its own untying*. Some commentators have given to the whole of the verse, the construction, that the prophets themselves were ignorant

* Acts, i. 11.

† St. Luke, i. 70.

of the true sense of the prophecies which they uttered. This they think is required by the following verse: "For prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." There can be no question that the Prophets understood what they uttered only so far as the Holy Ghost vouchsafed to interpret his own meaning. But I apprehend that the text means much more than this; and that in fact the paraphrase contained in one of the ancient versions* gives the true sense. "Knowing this first that all prophecy of the Scripture does not solve its own sense." Now this is a very important assertion; for it clearly distinguishes the difference between prophecy and all other inspired compositions. In those parts of Holy Scripture, for example, which are argumentative, as the Epistle to the Hebrews, or that of St. Paul to the Romans, not only did the inspired writer himself understand what he uttered, but the words uttered are also to be explained by the ordinary rules of criticism, and therefore contain their interpretation within themselves. Not so with prophecy. "You are especially to understand," says St. Peter, "that all prophecy of the Scripture is not made of its own untying." It is not so framed as to afford the solution of its own sense. To obtain a clear, literal, exact knowledge of the words of a prophecy is indeed very important. But when we have done this, we may have advanced but a very small step towards the understanding of the prophecy. It can be solved only by the coming of those events which it was intended to foreshadow. The very connection between its meaning and the occurrence of the events by which it is

* The Arabic.

solved, shows, not only that the prophet himself did not fully understand what he was saying, but also that his thoughts must of necessity have been dictated by the Holy Ghost ; because *no man would write what he did not and could not understand, unless he were moved to do so by a power superior to his own will.*

Such is the *true*, because it is the *literal* meaning of this important text. It is not a *new* meaning adopted to serve a purpose, or confirm a theory. If it were, I should have been one of the last to propose it to you. It is nearly as old as the Epistle itself ; for it occurs in the most ancient versions.

The words of the text being thus examined so far as it was necessary to elucidate their meaning, we will proceed to their subject, which is

PROPHECY CONCERNING THE POWER AND COMING OF OUR
LORD JESUS CHRIST.

And in considering this subject, the text confines our attention,

- I. TO ITS CERTAINTY.
- II. TO ITS USE.
- III. TO ITS INTENT ; AND
- IV. TO ITS IMPORTANCE.

May that same Blessed Spirit who dictated these prophecies, and who now presides over the Church, in the absence of her Lord, as her present though invisible Comforter and Advocate—may that same Blessed Spirit be our guardian against the errors of rash, and ignorant, and presumptuous expounders of his word ! May he keep us “steadfast in faith, joyful through hope, and

rooted in charity !”* May he shine in our hearts, to give us the light of the glory of God, in the face of Jesus Christ !

I.—THE CERTAINTY OF PROPHECY.

On this point I shall say but little, because I am not arguing with Infidels, but addressing myself to a Christian congregation, who, I am willing to believe, search the Scriptures themselves, and are anxious to understand them rightly.

The text assures us that the prophets “spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.” But “God is not a man that he should lie ; neither the son of man that he should repent : hath he said, and shall he not do it ? or hath he spoken, and shall he not make it good ?”† Therefore the prophetic word is most sure, and will as certainly come to pass as it is certain that God is true. When St. Peter wrote his epistle, the Apocalypse or Revelation of St. John was not written. There was an interval between them of about thirty years. But as the Revelation claims to be a divinely-inspired prophecy ; as that claim has been admitted by the Church from the beginning ; as it has the same internal marks of truth as the other Scriptures ; and its analogies are all in perfect harmony with the other prophetic writings ; it comes within the scope of St. Peter’s declaration, and is therefore to be received as the sure and certain language of the Holy Ghost.

All arguments against the certainty of prophecy proceed from an evil heart of unbelief ; and as extremes

* 2 Corinthians, iv. 6.

† Numbers, xxiii. 19.

meet, these arguments are sometimes heard from the disappointed enthusiast, as well as from the impure scoffer. The enthusiast who has persuaded himself that his computations are infallible, doubts the truth of the revelation, because it does not accord with his fancies. The scoffer derides God's solemn promises because they come not within the compass of his own personal experience. The conduct of both proceeds from the corrupt pride and licentious exercise of human reason ; and St. Peter, as if he foresaw both these classes of men, warns us in the sequel of this Epistle, against both. He tells us in the second chapter, that as there were false prophets among the Jews, so also shall there be false teachers among Christians, (including, of course, false interpreters of prophecy), on whose account the way of truth shall be evil spoken of.* He warns us also, in the third chapter, that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and saying, where is the promise of his coming ? for since the fathers fell asleep all things continue as they were from the beginning of creation."† To such he answers, in allusion, it may well be supposed, to the language of our Lord's own admonition,‡ by analogies from the fancied security of the wicked before the Deluge ; and, like the prophet Malachi to the scoffers of his time, he assures them that the Eternal changes not, and that his very delay is an act of long-suffering and mercy.§ Distance of time makes no difference in the truth of God's declarations—with him one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day.|| The

* 2 Pet. ii. 1, 2.

† 2 Pet. iii. 3, 4.

‡ Matt. xxiv. 37-44 ; Luke, xvii. 26, 27 ; 2 Pet. iii. 5-7.

§ Mal. iii. 6, which is an answer to the scoffs of the wicked in chap. ii. 17.

|| 2 Pet. iii. 8, 9.

Apostle ends his Epistle, therefore, with an exhortation that they will not suffer the taunts of scoffers or the ignorance of those who wrest the Scriptures to their own destruction, to make them fall from their steadfastness.*

With these few observations on the certainty of prophecy, I proceed to consider, in the second place,

II.—THE USE OF PROPHECY.

God's word in general is a lamp unto our feet and a light unto our path.† During the darkness of this mortal life it is necessary that we may guide our feet and employ our hands aright; but in the Heavenly Jerusalem there shall be no night, and they need no candle, neither light of the sun; for the Lord God giveth them light. The glory of God will lighten that city, and the Lamb will be the light thereof.‡ The use, then, of all Holy Scripture is confined to the present life. The same figure is in the text applied to prophecy. It is "a lamp burning in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the morning-star shall arise in our hearts." The figure itself denotes all that need be said concerning the use of prophecy. It is a lamp shining, not merely in a dark place, as we from the poverty of our language are obliged to translate it. For the word employed by St. Peter is one of much greater force. It denotes a place of filth in which the working of the mass of corruption beneath, sends up continually foul and noxious exhalations which render the atmosphere gross and heavy. In such an atmosphere a lamp burns dimly and with diffi-

* 2 Pet. iii. 10-18.

† Ps. cxix. 105.

‡ Rev. xxii. 5, and xxi. 23.

culty; the more dimly where there is the most corruption; the more brightly where the noxious exhalations are fewest. Whether St. Peter had or had not in his thoughts our Lord's parable of the ten virgins, that parable will aptly illustrate his meaning. The two classes of persons there described as having lamps are the religious and the irreligious; for wisdom, in the language of the Scriptures, denotes religion, and folly irreligion. The wise are righteous; the foolish are wicked. And now let us see how these two classes of persons use their lamps.

You will observe that the lamp of the prophetic word is given equally to both. The Holy Scriptures are not locked up, or confined to a few; and although the prophecies are not by any read and studied as much as they ought to be, because they do not contain their own solution, yet any man, however unlearned, if he is constant in attending the ministrations of the Church, cannot fail, with a proper degree of attention, to become familiar with the language and the general sense of the most important predictions concerning the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.

But there is this difference between the situation of these two classes. The wise are aware of the noxious influence of sin. They know that by nature we are in a state of moral pollution which causes the word of God to burn dimly. They strive, therefore, by avoiding the society of wicked persons, by prayer, by meditation, by watchfulness, and especially by the use of all those means of grace which God hath appointed in his Church, to overcome the corrupting influences of sin. From these causes alone the light of prophecy is to them clearer

than it can be to the foolish. "The light of the righteous," saith Solomon, "rejoiceth: but the lamp of the wicked shall be put out."^{*}

The righteous, however, as well as the wicked, dwell in the world, and must suffer, in a greater or less degree, from the grossness of its atmosphere. From its influences, and the frailties of our mortal nature, they, as well as the foolish, slumber and sleep. None are so wide awake, and so watchful, as they ought to be. Nevertheless, they do not always slumber; but arise from time to time and trim their lamps, heedful of the danger of letting them burn dimly, and knowing that if not constantly trimmed, the corrupt influences of the world may put them out. The foolish, on the other hand, slumber on, utterly regardless of their lamps, and utterly unconcerned at the danger of being left in total darkness.

There is another distinguishing characteristic in the conduct of the wise and the foolish. The oil with which the lamp of prophecy is fed is knowledge. The text assures us that prophecy does not solve its own sense. The knowledge of God's moral government of the universe can alone untie its meaning. That knowledge can be obtained only from the patient study of history as to what is past, and a devout, and serious, and heedful attention to the occurrences of the portentous present. But in the study of history, or in the contemplation of that mighty diorama which is now passing by us on the world's theatre, men look with very different eyes according as they are religious or irreligious. In the contemplation of events whether past or present, the wise see constantly the hand of God, directing all things ac-

* Prov. xiii. 9.

cording to the counsel of his will, and making the passions, and the interests, and even the crimes and the follies of men subservient to the great purpose of establishing his own eternal kingdom. The foolish, on the contrary, confine their view only to second causes. The judgments of God are far above out of their sight.* They see not, that the whole history of mankind, in the ages antecedent to the first coming of Christ, was intended to prepare for that event; and that since his first coming the whole series of history has, in like manner, been directed preparatory to his second coming. They see not, that the raising up or casting down of empires, of Babylon, of Persia, of Greece, or of Rome, were all parts of one mighty plan, to bring men for salvation to the Redeemer's cross; nor that the irruption of the northern barbarians, the destruction of old and the founding of new kingdoms, the successes of the false prophet in the east, or of the papacy in the west, the discovery of the new continent, the revolutions of Germany, the convulsions of France and Spain, the civilisation of Russian hordes, the vast extension of British power, and the wide-spreading influence of the American Republic, are only so many links in the chain of causes and effects with which are connected the second coming of our Lord and the triumph of the Church in glory. Here then is the difference between these two classes; the one seeking continually to pour in new knowledge into the lamp of prophecy that it may burn brighter and brighter; the other, from unbelief, neglecting the acquisition and the application of that knowledge, and suffering the lamp almost to expire for want of feeding it with its proper nutriment.

* Ps. x. 5.

But on this subject there is another and a most important consideration. All the members of the two classes whom I have described are not competent of themselves to obtain or to dispense this knowledge. It pleased God therefore to make a special provision for this purpose; before the first coming of Christ, by the Patriarchal and the Levitical priesthood; after the first, and until the second coming, by the Christian priesthood. Hence when the voice of prophecy ceased before our Lord's first coming, the latest of the prophets was inspired to direct the people to the priesthood, and to lay upon the priesthood that necessary burden: "The priest's lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth: for he is the Messenger of the LORD of Hosts."* And accordingly, when the Eastern Sages demanded at Jerusalem where Christ should be born, Herod thought not of applying to any other source, but "gathered all the chief priests and scribes of the people together"† to inspect the prophecies and answer the question. So also in the Christian Church the same responsible duty is assigned by our Lord to those whom he hath appointed. In that remarkable chapter in which the nature of his kingdom is illustrated by so many and such various similitudes, (I mean the thirteenth of St. Matthew), after asking his disciples if they understood his meaning, he added what is in fact an awful admonition of the duties as well as the privileges of the Christian priesthood; "Therefore every scribe which is instructed unto the kingdom of Heaven is like unto a man that is an householder, which bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old."‡ The priesthood are

* Mal. ii. 7.

† Matt. ii.

‡ Matt. xiii. 51-52.

called "to be messengers, watchmen and stewards of the Lord; to teach and to premonish, to feed and provide for the Lord's family."* Such is God's arrangement; and the wise members of his Church, who are not able to acquire by their own learning and observation that knowledge by which the prophecies can be explained, will apply for it to those whom God hath appointed to dispense from the storehouse of his Church, things new and old, which it is their duty constantly to lay up for the use of the Lord's family. But what, on the other hand, is the conduct of the foolish? Forgetful of God's positive injunctions to go to his appointed ministers; forgetful of our Lord's warning that many should come in his name and deceive many; forgetful of the prohibitions not to go forth from the Church which is God's city, into the wilderness, nor from the Church which is God's house, into the secret chambers; they rush forth at every cry of "lo, here is Christ, or lo, there," and seek to trim the lamp of prophecy, with the false knowledge of every ignorant and uncommissioned pretender. Whereas, one of the great uses of prophecy is to bind men to that Church which God himself hath declared to be the pillar and ground of the truth. The oil of knowledge must be pure, not thick and viscid, if we would have the light burn brightly; and therefore men should seek for it where God hath ordered it to be distributed. By a comparison of the expositions of prophecy which have been made at various times in God's Church we are enabled to see how far in every age it has been fulfilled and understood. The gradual unfolding of events renders that intelligible which was once obscure; and

* Office for the ordination of priests.

thus we are brought onward by insensible approaches towards the dawn, having enough of light to increase our faith, and enough obscurity to keep it in constant exercise. This will be more properly considered under our third head,

III.—THE INTENT OF PROPHECY.

I have already remarked that all the prophecies may be ranged under two heads; the one intended to prepare for our Lord's first coming, the other for his second coming; the one vouchsafed to the Patriarchal and Levitical dispensations, the other designed more especially for the Christian Church. Now, by considering the manner in which the first operated, we may safely infer how the last should operate.

No sooner had the darkness begun by the sin of Adam than the lamp of prophecy was lighted. The Saviour was announced as the seed of the woman; and the promise was given, that the great spiritual enemy who had deprived them of the light of God's countenance, should by that seed be overcome. But when, or how, or by whom, all this should be effected, they knew not. The lamp burnt dimly because the oil of knowledge was but scantily bestowed. There was just enough of light to kindle hope in their hearts, and to keep them from despair, but not enough to do away the darkness, or, as if their sin had been slight or trifling, to make them presume upon God's mercy.

Ingratitude to God, a disposition to disobey his will, and a desire to substitute the sovereignty of the creature for that of the Creator, are the characteristics of fallen man. Hence proceeded the denial of God, and the varied forms

of idolatry. The foolish heart of man was darkened, the oil of knowledge was not sought, and to all save only to one family the light was quenched in the horrors of a watery deluge.

With Noah and the patriarchal church the lamp of prophecy was rekindled ; but in less than four hundred years, mankind had again turned from the light, to walk in the darkness of idolatry and moral corruption. God chose the faithful Abraham to keep alive the flame, suffering it gradually to expire among the surrounding nations.

Even these special mercies were long ineffectual. A constant succession of prophets, by whom the Lord was pleased to make bare his arm, did not cure the chosen people even of the sin of idolatry, until they had suffered the terrible chastisement of a national captivity. From that time we read not of any inclination among the inhabitants of Judah to serve the gods of the nations, and therefore the lamp of prophecy concerning the coming of the promised seed was then made to burn with a brighter and more steady flame. The time in which the promised Redeemer should come began to be calculated. The expectation of the near approach of that time, founded on the prophecies, became general. And thus we are at once presented with a clear and distinct view of the intent for which those prophecies were given, which began with the Babylonish captivity and ended with the finishing of the second temple. It was not to give men a definite knowledge of futurity. It was not to enable them to say exactly in what year the Christ would come, or the exact manner of his coming. If it had been, the very purpose of these prophecies would have been defeated. For St. Paul argues that "none of the princes

of this world knew the wisdom of God in a mystery ; for had they known it they would not have crucified the Lord of glory.”* What more apt description of prophecy could there be, than the expression here used by the Apostle, “ *The wisdom of God in a mystery?*” The princes of this world fulfilled the prophecies because they did not understand them. There was enough of light to make them sure that the time was at hand for Christ’s coming. They knew that the prophetic weeks of Daniel were drawing near to their close. They knew from Haggai† and Malachi‡ that the Lord whom they sought would suddenly come to that very temple then standing. And they might have known from Daniel§ that the Messiah should be cut off, and the city and sanctuary destroyed. But the clear meaning of these prophecies was proved only by the events ; and even now, sure as we are of the time when our Lord first came, there is great difficulty in deciding when the seventy weeks of Daniel began and ended, and what is the precise meaning of the whole of that remarkable prediction. Yet this obscurity, and this utter impossibility, did not hinder the holy Simeon, the devout Anna, and all that looked for redemption in Jerusalem, from inquiring diligently what the Spirit should mean. And it deserves our especial consideration that the Holy Ghost rewarded the righteousness and piety and earnest desire for knowledge of holy Simeon, by revealing to him that he should not die before he had seen the Lord’s Christ. Yet, if the weeks of Daniel ended, as some have thought, with our Lord’s crucifixion, or as others have imagined, at the destruction of the city and temple by the Romans, the prediction of the Holy

* 1 Cor. ii. 7, 8.

† Mal. iii. 1.

† Hag. ii. 7, 9.

§ Dan. ix. 26.

Ghost was fulfilled to Simeon more than seventy, or at the earliest calculation, more than thirty years before the seventy weeks were terminated. Here then is the most certain evidence that the intention of prophecy was to keep men perpetually on the watch, on account of the very uncertainty as to the time of its fulfilment. Any absolute certainty would have defeated the very design for which it was given. There was light enough to enable all pious believers under the old dispensation to know about the time for the first coming of Christ, provided they sought for the pure oil of knowledge where God ordered them to seek it, and then were careful to keep their lamps trimmed and burning.

The same order which the Holy Ghost observed in preparing for the first coming of our Lord, is now plainly visible, in the preparation for his second coming. In the New Testament there are prophecies added to the Old; by our Lord himself in the gospels; by the Apostles Paul, James, Peter, Jude and John in their Epistles; and especially by the last named Apostle in the Apocalypse or Revelation. All have reference to this last age, last generation, period, or dispensation; all of which are only various terms to denote the duration of the Christian Church, from the first coming of our Lord in the flesh, till his second coming in glorious majesty.

We see in these prophecies, the same designed obscurity which existed under the old dispensation; and that precisely for the same object,—namely, to rouse our attention, to excite our faith in God's overruling providence, to animate our hopes, to encourage our exertions, but not to gratify our curiosity, or enable us to anticipate the future.

An irregular desire of knowledge was the occasion of

man's fall. It is therefore the design of God to humble us unto the acknowledgment of His infinite power and wisdom, and our own utter ignorance and insufficiency. We are required to walk by faith, not by sight; to possess our souls in patience; to work out our salvation with fear and trembling; and to watch and pray because we know not the hour of our Lord's coming. To make known that hour comes not within the commission of our Lord as the head of the Mediatorial kingdom; for he himself hath said "Of that day and that hour *knoweth* (a Hebrew expression meaning *maketh known*) no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father."* He tells his disciples the special reason for this mystery. "Take ye heed, watch and pray; for ye know not when the time is." And he adds the solemn declaration that this mystery must continue even to the end: "What I say unto you, I say unto all, watch."

The premature disclosure of the exact time of our Lord's second coming not being the purpose or intent of the prophetic word, let us proceed to consider, in the fourth and last place,

IV.—THE IMPORTANCE OF PROPHECY.

After what has been said of the certainty, use and intent of prophecy, little need be added concerning its importance. When God speaks to his creatures "by the mouth of his holy prophets"—the message must be important. Whether we can or cannot understand it, makes no difference. If not understood, it is the greater

* Mark, xiii. 32.

trial of our faith. But its importance to us is to be measured by the duties it imposes; and these will be best considered if we divide them into the duties of the Clergy and of the Laity.

The duties of the Clergy grow out of their office in the Church of God as Stewards and as Watchmen.

As Stewards it is their duty to keep knowledge; not merely that learning which enables them to understand the text of Scripture, but a knowledge of past history and a Christian view of the present. It cannot be expected that all God's ministers should be equally learned; but the learning ought to exist somewhere; and it is the duty of the Church to see that it be as much diffused as possible. The appointed Steward brings forth from the treasures which the Lord hath put into his keeping things new and old. He studies the prophecies in their original tongue; he examines the ancient and modern translations; he searches the interpretation which has been made of them from age to age. In this way, he is enabled to know all that the reason and learning of antecedent ages have been able to effect. Not content with this merely, he consults the pages of sacred and profane history; he weighs conflicting testimony; he examines accurately the dates on which the computations of prophecy are founded. As the course of events can alone unlock the meaning of prophecy, he marks the workings of God's moral government of states and nations, and compares with them the language of prophecy; not with the view of establishing some favorite theory, but of determining if possible how far the mystery can be clearly solved, and how far it is yet impenetrable. All this is done, not for himself personally, but for all those whom God hath entrusted to his care.

As a watchman his duty is twofold ; first, “to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God’s word ;”^{*} and secondly, to warn and exhort the faithful to prepare for the second coming of their Lord.

The duties of the laity proceed also from their station in the Church of God. That portion of it to which we belong, puts into the hands of the humblest and the most ignorant of her children, the precious word of God as a lamp that burneth ; but avoiding too much deference to human authority on the one hand, and too little regard for the wisdom of past ages on the other, she requires them to seek for knowledge of those who have been set over them in the Lord. It is a fearful and a perilous thing when men usurp an office which does not belong to them, and for which they are not qualified. “My Brethren,” says St. James, “be not many masters, knowing that ye shall receive the greater condemnation.” The office of an Interpreter of God’s word is one of awful responsibility. He must not only keep his own lamp trimmed and burning, but he must also provide for the many who seek at his mouth that pure knowledge which maketh them wise unto salvation. Who does not tremble at the thought that his ignorance may cause their light to be extinguished !

Followers of Jesus Christ, ye are standing with the light of prophecy in your hands. The stewards of God’s mysteries are continually by his command enabling you to keep it trimmed and burning. The watchmen on the walls of God’s city are anxiously looking out for the dawn and the rising of the morning star. The night is

* Office for the ordination of priests.

far spent ; the day is at hand. It is high time to awake out of sleep. Whether surprised by death or by judgment is to you the same thing. Such as ye are at the close of life, such will ye be in the morning of the resurrection. In either case, YE KNOW NOT THE DAY NOR THE HOUR IN WHICH THE SON OF MAN COMETH.

NOTE.

On comparing this sermon with the Appendix, the reader will observe that some of the dates in the sermon are not the same as those in the Appendix. The separation of the ten tribes, for example, is said in the sermon to have taken place 975 years before Christ; whereas in the Appendix it is computed to have been 988 years before the common Christian era. The reason of this difference is, that in the sermon the author followed the computations of Petavius and Usher; whereas in the Appendix he has gone over all the calculations himself, with the advantage of being able to consult the chronology of Dr. Hales. Where these eminent chronologers differ, he has examined their authorities, and assigned his reasons for his preference.

SERMON II.

2 THESSALONIANS, ii. 1, 2.

“Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand.”

It appears that some expressions used by St. Paul in his first Epistle to the Church in Thessalonica had been misinterpreted, as if he meant to say that the second coming of our Lord Jesus Christ was then shortly to take place. This error had been eagerly seized upon by certain false teachers, in order to produce a great excitement among their hearers; and by various artifices, such as raising reports of words uttered by the Apostle, or of letters received from him, and even by pretending to divine inspiration, these teachers had actually unsettled the minds of many, and induced some to forsake the employments by which they supported themselves and their families, and thus to walk disorderly. This is evident from the various admonitions contained in this Epistle, especially in the last chapter; but it is briefly expressed in the second verse of the text. For the word rendered “shaken” is a figure taken from the tossing of a ship at anchor by a violent gale of wind; and being

“shaken in mind” signifies the being dragged as it were from the anchorage of a sound understanding. The term rendered “troubled” means also that sort of bewilderment occasioned by sudden surprise, or grief, or terror, which unfits men to “work with quietness, and eat their own bread.”* The Apostle therefore addressed to them this second Epistle exhorting them by that very coming of our Lord, which to all true Christians would be a day of rejoicing, because they would then be gathered together unto Christ, not to suffer any pretences to spiritual illumination, or any false reports of what he had said or written to throw them into this state of frenzy. “We beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter, as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand.” He then warns them not to let any man deceive them, and to prevent their being deceived, he adds that most remarkable prophecy concerning the grand apostasy and the coming of the Man of Sin, which most Protestant commentators apply to Papal Rome, but which the Romanists consider as yet unfulfilled, and as referring to some future Antichristian or Infidel power.

It deserves to be remarked here, that in the subsequent history of the Christian Church, two periods are mentioned in which the same panic terrors existed; the first, in the fifth century, the second, in the tenth. In the fifth century occurred that period of desolation and woe which a great historian has pronounced to be the most calamitous in the progress of human affairs. The irrup-

* 2 Thessalonians, iii. 12.

tion of the Northern Barbarians was compared by contemporary writers to the havoc occasioned by earthquakes, conflagrations, and deluges.* This led to the persuasion that the 70 weeks of Daniel, or the period of 490 years, was to precede the second, and not the first coming of Christ; and that the abomination of desolation spoken of by the prophet was, only for a short space of time, to precede the general judgment. We have still existing a curious correspondence between St. Augustin and Hesychius, a Bishop of Dalmatia, carried on about 420 years after our Saviour's birth, in which the very same arguments are employed on either side, as are now employed on the same subject: only with this difference, that Hesychius did not pretend to compute exactly the day or the year of our Lord's second coming, while Augustin quoted the words of our present text and the subsequent prophecy concerning the Man of Sin whom he took to be Antichrist, to show that the end was not yet.†

It does not appear whether this opinion had many followers; but in the tenth century a very general panic prevailed, from a mistaken interpretation of that passage in the Revelations in which it is foretold that Satan, who had been bound, as they supposed, at our Lord's first coming, should, at the end of a thousand years, again be let loose for a little season, and then should follow the general judgment. This opinion spread rapidly over Europe, and gained universal credit. "A general consternation seized mankind; many relinquished their possessions; and abandoning their friends and families,

* Robertson's Charles V., sec. 1, vol. i. p. 9.

† August. Op., ed. Ben. Antwerp. Tom. ii. c. 567. Epist. 199, § 11.

hurried with precipitation to the Holy Land, where they imagined that Christ would quickly appear to judge the world.”*

I need not tell you that a similar panic is now spreading through our own country, founded, as those were which I have mentioned, upon fanciful interpretations of the prophecies. I call them fanciful, because they are unsupported by historic truth, and violate (from ignorance, I trust, and not from design) the meaning and intent of Holy Scripture.

It will be expected from me that I should prove these grave charges; but to do that fully would require a volume, and not a single lecture. Bold assertions and inaccurate computations are easily made and occupy but little space. To show that they are unfounded and fallacious, requires a great deal of practical labor, and careful and minute examination. From this I would willingly save both you and myself. Happily the time is short, and events will soon show where the mistake lies. To abridge the argument, I shall confine your attention to the great points in which the computations of Mr. Miller are extravagant or defective. We will consider as admitted, that in prophetic language a day is often put for a year; that a month consists of thirty days and is put for thirty solar years; and consequently that twelve months or 360 prophetic days mean so many solar years. We will admit, that in the prophecies of Daniel, a week stands for seven solar years; and that a time, times, and the dividing of time, means three and a half

* Robertson's Charles V., sec. 1, vol. i. p. 21. Hallam's Middle Ages, vol. ii. p. 218. Ed. Paris. For a fuller account see Mosheim Cent. X., V. ii. ch. iii. sec. 3.

prophetic years, equivalent to 42 months, 1260 days or so many solar years. It will follow from these admissions that the double of this sum, or the perfect number seven times or years, would in the language of Daniel denote 2520 solar years. Let us admit all this, and then let us proceed to consider the superstructure which Mr. Miller has built upon this foundation.

The three great points to which I shall confine your attention are,

I. That the punishment of God's chosen people was to continue seven prophetic times, or 2520 years :

II. That the 2300 prophetic days of Daniel are to be computed as beginning with the 70 weeks and ending in this present year : and,

III. That the present year completes the six thousandth year of the world, and therefore that the seven thousandth period, or great Millennial Sabbath, is now about to begin.

I.—THE PUNISHMENT OF GOD'S CHOSEN PEOPLE.

To prove that God's chosen people were to be punished seven prophetic times or 2520 years, Mr. Miller relies principally on the 26th chapter of Leviticus. God there denounces a curse on the nation of Israel if they should break his commandments ; and after threatening them with the sore judgments of famine, pestilence and war, he adds (v. 18), "And if ye will not yet for all this hearken unto me, then I will punish you *seven times* more for your sins." These seven times Mr. Miller understands as seven prophetic times or 2520 years, and then proceeds to calculate so as to make them end in 1843.

I shall hope to show you that even if his interpretation were right (which it certainly is not) it would not help his theory; for it would prove too much, and it would not agree with his dates.

It would in the first place prove too much; for the threatening of seven times is repeated in the 21st, 24th, and 28th verses. A series of judgments are denounced; beginning with the declaration, if ye will not be reformed, then I will punish you seven times more. If the first seven would not reform, God would inflict the second seven; if the second seven would not reform, he would inflict the third seven; if the third seven proved ineffectual, he would inflict the fourth. Here then there are at least four sevens, or twenty-eight prophetic times, amounting to ten thousand and eighty years. This threat, according to Mr. Miller's chronology, could not have been made earlier than B. C. 1643; and if it had begun to operate immediately there would still be remaining in this present year 6594 years of punishment!!!

But let us allow what he assumes, that in these successive threatenings, only one period of seven prophetic times is meant; the next question arises, when did this period begin, and when will it end? Mr. Miller answers that it ends in 1843, and consequently began B. C. 677. In that year, he says, Manasseh king of Judah was carried captive to Babylon, and the ten tribes were also carried away by Esarhaddon. All this is easily said; and to persons who take his assertions without examination, they appear very plausible. But I scruple not to assert that he cannot prove one word of what he has so confidently uttered. If you will attentively examine the 26th chapter of Leviticus you will see that the judg-

ments threatened are progressive. Those of the first seven times consist in breaking the pride of their power and rendering their land barren; the second, in the increase of their internal and domestic calamities; the third, in the invasion of foreign foes, the scourge of pestilence, and their subjugation to their enemies; the fourth, in the infliction of still more dreadful punishments, such as eating the flesh of their own children to appease the cravings of hunger, the destruction of their sanctuaries, the scattering them among the heathen, and their utter national debasement. Behold in these prophetic warnings the history of the nation, fulfilled and fulfilling even before our own eyes. But the breaking of their power commenced as early as the death of Solomon, and the revolt of the Ten Tribes. Both events took place, as the best chronologers agree, B. C. 975. From that period Israel and Judah were constantly punished with increasing judgments. Israel, as being the worst and the most incorrigible, finally became extinct as a nation in the ninth year of their king Hoshea, B. C. 721,* having continued as a separate kingdom, 250 years. Judah took no warning from this dreadful catastrophe, and finally, therefore, shared the same fate under Zedekiah, about 133 years later; that is, according to Petavius, B. C. 589, according to Abp. Usher, B. C. 588, or a year later. The ten tribes never returned, and to this day no one knows their fate. Judah, being less guilty, was restored after a captivity of seventy years, and continued to exist as a nation until the year 70 after Christ, when the second sanctuary was destroyed, and all the evils came again upon the nation which they had suffered

* 2 Kings, xvii. 6-18.

when the first temple was burned. You have only to read the History of Josephus in connection with your Bibles to see that God's threatenings in Leviticus were fulfilled even to the letter. Precisely the events recorded from the 28th to the 39th verses of the 26th chapter, events which none but Omniscience could predict, came to pass at both those periods, though in a more awful degree at the last than at the first. Now if we date from B. C. 975, as the beginning of their punishment, the 2520 years must have ended in the year of our Lord 1545; if from the extinction of the ten tribes B. C. 721, they must have ended in 1799. If we date from the Babylonish Captivity the term of punishment will not have ended till the year 1931 or 1932, and there yet remain for its fulfilment 88 or 89 years.

How then, it will be asked, did Mr. Miller arrive at his dates? He took 1843 from 2520 which gave him 677 years before Christ as the commencement of his seven prophetic times; and then he asserted that Manasseh was carried captive to Babylon in that year, and that then also "the ten tribes were carried away by Esarhaddon, king of Babylon."* This last date he obtained by subtracting 65 from 742; that being the supposed year in which Isaiah's prophecy was uttered concerning the breaking of Ephraim (chap. vii. 8.), "within three score and five years." But the kingdom of Israel or the ten tribes, sometimes called from the name of its most powerful tribe, the kingdom of Ephraim, was utterly broken down 44 years earlier, not by "Esarhaddon, king of Babylon," "but by Shalmaneser, king of Assyria."†

* Life and Views, p. 45.

* 2 Kings.

And as for the captivity of Manasseh, it is very uncertain in what year it took place, or how long it continued. Both the scriptures and Josephus are equally silent on the subject. Manasseh began to reign B. C. 698, and continued to reign 55 years until B. C. 643. The nation was not carried into captivity, nor could the king have long continued a prisoner. The threatenings occasioned by the wickedness of Manasseh were not brought upon Judah till 54 or 55 years after his death. What then becomes of Mr. Miller's date for the commencement of his 2520 years? It has nothing to support it but conjecture, and it would never have been assumed, if he had not first formed his theory and then looked about for arguments to sustain it.

We have hitherto proceeded on the supposition that the words "seven times" in the 26th chapter of Leviticus are susceptible of Mr. Miller's interpretation. But they are not so. If he were acquainted with the original language of the Old Testament, he would have seen that the word used by Daniel which is translated by the English word "times" does not occur in Leviticus; that it is, in fact, language of a later date, and that in the sense of year or years, it is peculiar to that prophet. The expression in Leviticus translated seven times, might as well have been rendered sevenfold. It is in fact only a superlative to denote perfection or intensity. It is precisely analogous to the following expression in the New Testament, "Lord, how oft shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? till seven times? Jesus saith unto him, I say not unto thee, Until seven times: but, Until seventy times seven."* Would it not be thought a most

* Matthew xviii. 21, 22.

extraordinary interpretation, that Peter meant to ask, shall I forgive my brother 2520 years? or that our Saviour meant to answer, not 2520 years only, but seventy times that number? Yet it would not be more preposterous than to interpret the language of Leviticus in this manner. Moses intended the expression only to denote the intensity and severity of God's judgments. There is not therefore the least ground for this magnificent calculation of seven prophetic times (beginning B. C. 677 and ending A. D. 1843), within which, as a magic circle, all the other computations of prophecy are to be confined and adjusted.

I proceed to the second point in Mr. Miller's system which I think it important to notice.

II.—THE TWO THOUSAND THREE HUNDRED PROPHETIC DAYS OR YEARS OF DANIEL.

The profoundly learned Joseph Mede, who has thrown the same light upon prophecy which Sir Isaac Newton did upon the solar system, has laid down a rule with regard to the Revelations of St. John, which is equally applicable to all prophecy. It is to be "considered—as if it were a history and no prophecy—without supposal of any interpretation whatever. This is the first thing to be done—as a foundation, ground, and only safe rule of interpretation; and not interpretation to be made the ground and rule of it." For "if the order, method and connection of the visions be framed and grounded upon supposed interpretation, then must all proofs be founded upon begged principles and human conjecture."*

* Mede's Works, B. iii. Remains on some passages in the Apocalypse. Lond. 1677. Fol. p. 581.

Now here is the root of all Mr. Miller's errors. He makes a "supposed interpretation" the frame-work on which he erects "the order, method and connection of the visions" of Daniel. He has jumbled all these visions together in the most inextricable confusion, as if they constituted but one vision. Then, taking parts of one and parts of another, he has combined them all; putting a patch here and there from the Revelations of St. John, and from St. Paul's prophecies, according as he fancies the language to be applicable; and thus he dresses up a prophecy of his own creating, almost as monstrous as the terrific animals described in the visions. Thus, from one vision he takes 70 weeks or 490 years; from another vision, 2300 days or years. Then, assuming that the 490 years are the beginning of the 2300 years; that the 490 years ended at the crucifixion; and that the death of our Lord took place in the year 33 of the common era; he has collected all the materials necessary to erect his superstructure. He then triumphantly looks around and asks, "Can any man in his senses deny my interpretation? Do not 490 and 1810 make up 2300? Do not 33 and 1810 make up 1843? And is there not here the most certain proof that the world will come to an end in 1843? My dear hearers, are you prepared for it? Have you made your peace with God? Any one who does not believe me is like those who did not believe Noah or Lot; and all such will, as sure as they live, be consumed with fire before the 21st of March, 1844." No wonder that they who have never studied their Bibles are affrighted and bewildered by such language. Mr. Miller tells them that he has been studying the prophecies for seventeen years, and as they cannot contradict him, they think he must know. The only wonder is

that they who have studied their Bibles should have done it to so little purpose, as to be carried away with all this noise, and confidence, and vain assumption of knowledge.

The number 2300 occurs in the vision of the Ram and the He-Goat. As the angel himself gave a clue to Daniel there has been no controversy as to the general meaning of the vision. It is limited to two of the four great empires denoted in the preceding vision by four great beasts coming up from the sea. The Ram in this vision corresponds with the Bear of the former, and the Goat, with his four horns springing up after the destruction of one great horn, is the same as the Leopard with its four wings and four heads. The fourth beast, or the Roman Empire considered as one of the four beasts, is carefully excluded. This must be kept constantly in mind if we would avoid confusion. The territorial limits of this vision take in only the countries which became the dominions of Alexander the Great by the subjugation of the Medo-Persian Empire. Consequently the whole of Europe is excluded, excepting Macedonia, Greece, Epirus and Thrace.

Now within the territory thus bounded, out of one of the horns or kingdoms into which it was divided after the death of Alexander, there "came forth," it is said in the ninth verse, "a little horn."* The question arises, What was this little horn? The ancient commentators supposed that it was Antiochus Epiphanes;† being led into this mistake by confounding with the present vision

* Dan. viii. 9.

† Comm. S. Hieronymi in Dan. Proph. c. viii. Op. Ed. Benedict. Tom. iii. col. 1105. Many of the ancients, however, considered Antiochus as only a type of Antichrist.

that which is related in the 10th and 11th chapters. Sir Isaac Newton, "with that sagacity which was peculiar to him," (to use the words of a later commentator), was the first I believe who showed clearly that this little horn was the Roman power, which by the conquest of the Macedonian horn in the year B. C. 168 became for the first time a horn of the goat or Grecian Empire. Observe that it was not as the fourth great monarchy, denoted by the fourth beast, but simply as a horn of the goat, that the words of this vision can apply to Rome; and consequently that none of Europe west or north of Macedonia, Thrace, Epirus and Greece, had anything to do with it. This Mr. Miller entirely overlooks; and hence he talks of Macedon and Europe as being the Western horn of the goat.* Macedon and Europe! He might with equal propriety talk of Connecticut and the United States, or of Texas and America. He then quietly substitutes Europe for Macedon, and says, "Out of one of them" (the horns), "that is, *out of Europe*, came forth a little horn." Europe being thus substituted† for Macedon, he is at liberty to expatiate at will through Rome pagan and Rome papal, to confound all times, and seasons, and territories, and to bring down the whole to his favorite year 1843!

Alexander began to invade the Medo-Persian Empire in the year B. C. 334; and on the 20th of May of that year he fought the battle of the Granicus; to which river the vision evidently refers in speaking of the onset of the goat upon the ram. For it runs thus: "He (the

* Miller's Second Coming of Christ, p. 49.

† A slight examination of history will place this whole subject in its proper light.

goat) came to the ram that had two horns, which I had seen standing *before the RIVER*, and ran unto him in the fury of his power.”* That battle decided the fate of the Persian Empire, and opened a passage into the heart of Asia. The final battle of Arbela took place on the 1st of October, B. c. 331. The notable horn of the goat was soon broken. Alexander died at Babylon in the evening of May 22d, B. c. 324. He was succeeded by his half-brother Philip Aridæus, who was killed about the 22d September, B. c. 318. In the course of the following ten years Alexander Œgus and Hercules, the two sons of Alexander the Great, were put to death; and his whole family being now extinct, Antigonus, Ptolemy, Seleucus, Lysimachus, and Cassander, all took the title of kings in the year B. c. 306. Antigonus was slain in battle B. c. 302. But as his power had begun to decline B. c. 305; as in the same year his rival Seleucus became king of Babylon and Media; and as the reign of Ptolemy Lagus is computed as beginning in Egypt in the same year, being the nineteenth after the death of Alexander; we may justly consider the year B. c. 305 as that in which “the four notable horns came up toward the four winds of heaven;”† namely Cassander in the West, Lysimachus in the North, Seleucus in the East, and Ptolemy in the South. The horn or kingdom out of which came forth the little horn was the kingdom of Cassander, or Macedonia, the fundamental kingdom of Alexander’s Empire. From the moment in which the Romans conquered Macedonia, this horn of the goat began to “wax exceeding great;” “not by his own power,” to use the remarkable and expressive language of the 24th verse,

* Dan. viii. 6.

† Dan. viii. 8.

“but by the power” of the Romans. Between the years B. c. 168 and 30, a period of 138 years, it obtained by gift or conquest the whole of the other three horns. From the year B. c. 64, it cast down the Jewish nation and stamped upon it; afterwards it magnified itself against the prince of the host by putting the Messiah to death; and finally in the year 70 of the Christian era it took away the daily sacrifice, and cast down the place of the sanctuary. Jerusalem was destroyed, and the Jewish nation carried captive. Then follow the inquiry and the answer contained in the 13th and 14th verses, of which the following is a literal translation: “And I heard one holy one speaking, and one holy one said unto such an one who was speaking, Until when is the vision, the never-ceasing sacrifice, and the rebellion that maketh desolate, to give both the sanctuary and the host for a trampling under foot? And he said to me, Until evening-morning, two thousand three hundred. Then shall the sanctuary be expiated.” The vision is the whole vision of the Ram and He-Goat. The never-ceasing sacrifice was the daily morning and evening sacrifice perpetually offered in the Jewish Temple at the third and ninth hours, to represent the one perfect oblation and satisfaction offered once for all upon the cross by our Lord Jesus Christ. This was taken away and the sanctuary and the host were trodden under foot at the destruction of the City and Temple. How long is this vision to last? “Unto two thousand three hundred evening-mornings,” is the answer, “and then the sanctuary will be expiated or purified.” The Jewish nation ceasing to rebel, will cease to be trampled under foot. The sanctuary which their rebellion caused to be desolate and trampled under foot, shall be expiated or puri-

fied. The Jews converted to the Christian faith will be restored as a body-politic ; and a new temple expiated and purified will again represent the one great oblation ; not as before with the blood of slain beasts, but with the unbloody symbols which Christ himself appointed.

If it be asked, Why this unusual expression Evening-morning, if Day were meant, I frankly answer, I cannot tell. Some have inferred, and the learned Joseph Mede is one of them, that it was for the express purpose of avoiding a doubtful meaning, because the word day usually means year.* They therefore understand the phrase " Evening-morning " as excluding the prophetic, and meaning only the natural day ; and hence they apply the present prophecy, as did Josephus and the ancient Christian commentators, to the time of the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes.

This interpretation would of course be fatal to all Mr. Miller's calculations. It is not surprising, therefore, that it should be eagerly embraced by many of his opponents. But with all due deference, I think there are insuperable difficulties in the way of this scheme which makes Antiochus Epiphanes the little horn. It would be impossible for me to go into them here ; but they have been well pointed out by Sir Isaac Newton, and after him by Bishop Newton. I make no difficulty, therefore, in admitting the expression Evening-morning to mean a prophetic day. It is indeed an unusual mode of expression ; but it is derived from the Jewish way of computing time from sunset to sunset. Mr. Miller does not notice it, though it is put in the margin of the English Bible ; yet if it means a day in the fourteenth verse, it must mean

* Mede's Works, pp. 597, 599.

the same in the 26th. Why then does he interpret evening and morning in the latter verse of two distinct years? The angel there says, "The vision of the evening and the morning which hath been spoken, that is truth. Wherefore do thou shut up the vision; for it is for many days." Of what vision does he speak? Evidently of the vision he had just explained, the vision of the Ram and the He-Goat. This is called by way of distinction the vision of the evening and the morning in reference to the remarkable expression in the 14th verse, that it should continue until 2300 evening-mornings. And this is the very reason why he adds the command to shut it up, because the fulfilment of it should be so far distant: a strong collateral argument, as I understand it, for the interpretation of 2300 prophetic days. But Mr. Miller throws the whole subject into confusion by the arbitrary and fanciful distinction of what he calls the evening vision and the morning vision; the one meaning "the vision of the four beasts in the first year of Belshazzar, Daniel vii.; the other the vision of the Ram and He-Goat in the third year of Belshazzar, Daniel viii."* He might with equal propriety talk of 2300 evenings and 2300 mornings as meaning two different periods of prophetic days.

The vision of the evening and the morning being therefore only this one vision, we must, in the interpretation of it, strictly confine ourselves within its limits, as to time, or territory, or events. We are not to take in any time which preceded it; consequently we cannot reckon the seventy weeks as a part of the 2300 days; because the commandment to restore and to build Jeru-

* Christ's Second Coming, Lec. iii. § 50.

salem preceded the earliest date of this vision. We are not to take in any territory beyond the limits of the four kingdoms denoted by the four horns; or any events which have not reference to the subject of the vision. Consequently we cannot interpret it by the history of Europe in general, or of the Latin Church in particular, or by any events unconnected with the conversion and restoration of God's ancient people.

If these rules of interpretation be correct they give the finishing stroke to all Mr. Miller's calculations. If we date even from the rushing of the Goat upon the Ram in the fury of his power, the first invasion of the Medo-Persian Empire, the 2300 prophetic days will not end till the year of our Lord 1966. I do not mean to be understood as asserting this. I would rather imitate the caution of the learned Mr. Mede with regard to the times of the great Apostasy, "and curiously inquire not, but leave unto him who is the Lord of times and seasons." I mean only to say that, for aught Mr. Miller can show, there may yet be more than a century to come before the 2300 days shall be ended. Nay, Sir Isaac Newton goes further, and supposes that the time of their beginning was not earlier than the reign of Vespasian and the destruction of the second Temple. "Daniel's days," he observes, "are years; and these years may perhaps be reckoned either from the destruction of the Temple by the Romans in the reign of Vespasian, or from the pollution of the sanctuary by the worship of Jupiter Olympias, or from the desolation of Judea made in the end of the Jewish war by the banishment of all the Jews out of their own country, or *from some other period which time will discover.*"* Observe the modesty with which

* Sir Isaac Newton's Observations on Dan. and the Apoc., p. 122.

this great man ventured to speak of the future ; and then ask yourselves which is preferable, the modesty of a Newton, or the presumption of such a man as Miller. The prophecy is not yet fulfilled ; for the sanctuary has not yet been purified. Till that event takes place, it is impossible to know when the 2300 years began. The conversion of the Jews and their restoration to their own land can alone decide the question.

I have been obliged to take up so much of your time in the consideration of the second point, that I must treat as briefly as possible of Mr. Miller's chronological table, by which he attempts to show

III.—THAT THE PRESENT YEAR COMPLETES THE SIX THOUSANDTH OF THE WORLD.

The infinite wisdom of the Almighty mortifies the pride of man by limiting his knowledge even with respect to his own history. The exact age of the world has been at all times a subject of study and calculation ; and the science of chronology has, for many ages, exercised some of the most capacious and exalted minds : exalted and capacious, I mean not in God's sight, for there they are as nothing, but as it respects the estimation of their fellow-creatures ; exalted and capacious, whether we consider their intellectual powers, or their vast and varied information. Even to such minds, the annals of profane history afford but little help. They extend not with any certainty more than eight centuries before the Christian era ; and they are filled with discrepancies and contradictions, which even the sharpest intellects have not been able fully to correct and harmonize. If it were not therefore for God's revelation, the past, beyond a comparatively small circle, would be

almost as dark as the future. The books of the Old Testament afford us the only light by which we can irradiate the gloom ; and even here, to humble our curiosity, it has been permitted that there should be subjects of controversy. Two different editions or texts of the five books of Moses have been transmitted to these later times ; the one preserved by the Jews, the other, by their ancient enemies the Samaritans. These, while in general they exhibit a wonderful agreement, differ precisely on the subject of the world's age. To add to our perplexity, we have an ancient Greek translation, made several hundred years before Christ, and in such common use among the Jews, that the Apostles and Evangelists have quoted it even where it differs from the Hebrew. And here again, precisely on this same subject of the world's age, does this version differ from both the Jewish and the Samaritan text. In this state of doubt and difficulty, what is to be done ? Learned men have spent their lives in laboring to answer this question ; and the result has been that opinions have generally settled down in favor of what is called the Hebrew chronology, to distinguish it from the Samaritan, on the one hand, and the Greek, on the other. This is the chronology on which Archbishop Usher labored so acceptably, that the learned world, in general, have been willing to receive his work as a standard ; not as to every particular opinion which he has advanced, but as to the general rule of being guided by the Hebrew text as transmitted to us by the ancient people of God. According to that chronology, the first year of what we now call the Christian era coincided with the year of the world 4004 ; so that by adding 4003 years to our common dates we

arrive at the age of the world. Thus 1843 added to 4003 gives 5846 as the present age of the world.

The question now arises, Why has Mr. Miller departed from calculations which the wisdom of the learned in the most civilized portions of the world consents to receive; and consents, be it observed, notwithstanding all the prejudices which are apt to be produced by the difference of nations, languages, and creeds? By the confession of Mr. Miller's followers, if not by his own, the answer is, Because the received chronology does not uphold his favorite theory that the world is to be purified by fire in 1843. For in the *Midnight Cry* of Nov. 22, 1842, there is the following precious confession: "Two things are generally impressed on the public mind: first, that the world is but 5846 years old; and second, that it must continue about 6000 years in its present state. *When this subject was suggested to Mr. Miller, in 1840, he felt that it was an argument against his view of the prophetic periods.* He thought the matter over, and at length resolved to appeal from Archbishop Usher, (the great standard in chronology), to the Bible. *He spent three days* in tracing the times of the Old Testament, and, to his surprise, found 4157 years clearly proved from the Creation to Christ, leaving but 1843 to complete the 6000 years!" It appears then that the thought never occurred to him till 1840, and then only when it was suggested to him as an objection to his theory. He spent three days upon it! Three days! How wonderful! three whole days in determining questions which have exercised the most gifted and well-furnished minds not only for a whole life, but for a series of lives! Mr. Miller appeals from Archbishop Usher to the Bible, as if Archbishop Usher had not founded his

computations upon the Bible ; or as if Archbishop Usher could not weigh all questions on these difficult points better than Mr. Miller ; or as if Mr. Miller's three days thrown into one scale would make the whole lives of Petavius, Usher, Marsham, and a host of others, in the opposite scale, kick the beam ! Shall we laugh, or shall we weep, over such folly ?

But what is the result of this mighty discovery, this glorious revolution of three days ? Mr. Miller finds out that the world is 154 years older than Archbishop Usher made it ; both, be it observed, appealing to the Bible as their authority.

And now let us see how he supports his assertion. Archbishop Usher places the end of the Deluge in the year of the world 1656 ; Mr. Miller adds a year and makes it 1657. But this is in direct opposition to the Bible, which says that “ the waters were dried up from off the earth”* on the first day of the first month, of the six hundred and first year of Noah, or, in other words, when his 600th year was completed. Mr. Miller makes it at the end of the 601st year.

But one year is a trifle. Mr. Miller's grand discovery is in the book of Judges. For the first time in his life he has found out that there are difficulties in the chronology of that book. But does he, or do his followers suppose that this is a new discovery ? or that it has never before been carefully examined ? On the contrary, among the distinguished writers who have defended the Hebrew chronology, there is not one who has not accurately and deliberately gone over the whole ground. And the result has been that all have decided directly contrary to Mr. Miller.

* Gen. viii. 13.

The state of the question is this. In the first book of Kings (chap. vi., v. 1) the sacred historian records the important fact of the foundation of Solomon's Temple in the following solemn manner: "And it came to pass in the four hundred and eightieth year after the children of Israel were come out of the land of Egypt, in the fourth year of Solomon's reign over Israel, in the month Zif which is the second month, that he began to build the house of the Lord." If, then, we take from this sum of 480 years, 40 years during which the nation was in the wilderness, 40 years for the reign of Saul, 40 years for that of David, and the fourth year of Solomon, it leaves only 356 years from the entrance into the promised land to the establishment of the monarchy. This includes the government of Joshua and that of the Judges till the time of Samuel. But St. Paul, in his speech to the Jews of Antioch in Pisidia, states that God "gave unto them Judges about the space of 450 years until Samuel the prophet."* Mr. Miller contends that there is a contradiction here, and because the larger number is more favorable to his purpose, he chooses to take what he considers as St. Paul's testimony, and rejects the passage in the Hebrew Scriptures. In this way he makes the period from the departure out of Egypt to the building of the temple not 480 but 621 years; and thus he gains at once for his object 141 years.

But Mr. Miller does not take into his account the very great difference in the nature of this testimony. The passage, 1 Kings, vi. 1, is a formal official Record of the most exact and decisive character; the language of St. Paul a passing and merely incidental remark.

* Acts xiii. 20,

The historian meant to establish an epoch ; the orator had not the least thought of settling points of chronology. The historian wrote in Hebrew for his nation. He could not be mistaken ; and there are no various readings which can throw doubt over the integrity of the text. St. Paul, on the other hand, was addressing himself in Greek to Jews who lived in a Greek province, whose vernacular language was Greek, and who used the Greek translation. They were doubtless more familiar with the Greek chronology than with the Hebrew, and their prejudices were in favor of the larger numbers in the Greek Scriptures, because a more remote antiquity would favor their national vanity. Would it not have been unwise in St. Paul to shock their prejudices on a point which had no connection with his principal design ? Mr. Miller might just as well argue that because St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans quotes from the Greek Psalms a number of verses which do not exist in the Hebrew, therefore the Hebrew is wrong ; or because St. Luke inserts in the genealogy of our Saviour a name which occurs only in the Greek translation, that we must therefore give up our Hebrew Bibles and implicitly receive the Greek !

But there is a text in the book of Judges which Mr. Miller seems never to have thought of, but which effectually overthrows his calculations. His period of 621 years assumes that the number of years from the departure out of Egypt to the government of Jephthah was 402. Whereas Jephthah himself expressly states that the lands conquered from Sihon king of the Amorites in the 40th year after the departure from Egypt had been held by the Israelites at the time when he became Judge

300 years. Here then is at once a miscalculation by Mr. Miller of 62 years.

The best chronologers agree in dividing the whole period of 480 years into two minor periods, as follows :

- | | |
|---|-----------------|
| 1. From the departure out of Egypt to Jephthah, | 340 years |
| 2. From the beginning of Jephthah's government | |
| to the fourth year of Solomon, | - - - 140 years |
| | <hr/> 480 |

To bring the periods mentioned in the book of Judges within this time, they consider the Judges as ruling over different portions of the tribes, not over the whole ; and as being often contemporaneous not successive. In the same manner, the periods of oppression and bondage, and of rest, existed in one part of the land, and not in another, and consequently often ran parallel, and not successive. Mr. Miller commits many absurdities by supposing each of the Judges to have ruled successively over the whole nation with long intervening periods of oppression. In a word, he has assumed the very points which he ought to have proved.

All this may have come from ignorance. The poet has well said, that

“ A little learning is a dangerous thing ; ”

but Mr. Miller makes a merit of his own ignorance, and glories in that which to the Interpreter of the Bible is a shame. But I cannot so easily acquit him when he comes to the succession of the kings of Judah. Here, in his eagerness to make out his scheme, he absolutely falsifies the language of the Bible. He makes Jehoram to have reigned five years, where the Scripture positively says he reigned eight ; and between Amaziah and Aza-

riah or Uzziah, he introduces an interregnum of eleven years, for which he has not even the shadow of an authority in the Bible. He quotes indeed chapters 14 and 15 of the 2d book of Kings; and this may be sufficient for those who are ready to take his opinions upon trust. But if you examine the chapters to which he refers, you will be astonished to find that there is not in either of them one word upon the subject. By these various methods of interpolations he gains in the history of the Jews at least 150 years.

He makes equally wild work with profane history. In looking through his books it is observable that the only author quoted for the chronology of the kings of Persia is Rollin. The ancient history of that writer is a popular and pleasing abridgment; but it is not to be depended upon for accuracy. The Authors of the Ancient Universal History,* which is indeed a lofty monument of English learning, are forced, on this very subject of chronology, to make the following remarks concerning the French writer. Speaking of Pul and Tiglath Pileser they say: "It is an eyesore to see them so disjoined as they are in Rollin, from whose judgment, as he is conversant in the labors and improvements of the later writers, we might have hoped for better things; but as we have been hitherto cautious of passing any censure upon him, we shall for the future avoid the same, *as he is a gentleman who does not so professedly write to instruct the mind as to the reality and consistence of facts,*

* This celebrated work, (the ancient part I mean, for the modern is far inferior), is too well known to need any commendation here. The octavo edition is the best, and is entitled "An Universal History from the earliest account of time, compiled from Original Authors:" Lond., 1747. 8vo. Vol. iv. p. 312, note.

as to form it to virtue and a good life." In their opinion, then, Rollin is to be endured, and may be put into the hands of children, because he subserves the interests of morality and religion!

But since Mr. Miller quotes Rollin as his only authority, it would be natural to expect that he would be guided by Rollin in his dates. Not so. He has departed from his author in almost every instance. The first year of the reign of Cyrus is placed by Rollin in the year B. c. 536; by Miller, B. c. 526. The commencement of the reign of Darius, the son of Hystaspes, is placed by Rollin in the year B. c. 521; by Miller, in the year B. c. 513. Xerxes began his reign, according to Rollin B. c. 485; according to Miller, B. c. 477. The seventh year of Artaxerxes Longimanus is placed by Rollin in the year B. c. 467; by Miller, in the year B. c. 457. He constantly differs from his author from eight to ten years. Why was all this? The answer is obvious: To adjust facts to his theory, and not his theory to facts. Like Procrustes, he stretches or lops off the limbs of his victims, that he may measure them by his own iron bed.

It has been with unfeigned reluctance that I have undertaken the labor of exposing Mr. Miller's errors. Nothing but your desire to know my views with regard to his scheme of prophecy, could have induced me to devote the time and patience which were necessary for that purpose. I have not the vanity to suppose that I shall be extensively quoted as an authority; or that anything I can now say will have any influence over Mr. Miller or his followers.

But there is another source of sorrow in my heart

which relates to Mr. Miller personally. I do not know, and probably have never seen him. I can therefore judge of him only by his writings; and the experience of ages has proved, that such judgment is often deceptive. Notwithstanding all I have said of his unwarrantable perversion of the Scriptures, I believe that, by some ingenious process of his own mind, he has convinced himself that he is right. I look upon him therefore as sincere, though ignorant, and as well-meaning, though fanatical. In the examination of his books, I have been often struck with the strange mixture of good sense and absurdity scattered through them, and have been often edified by his excellent and pious observations on the necessity of being in readiness to meet our Judge. The "Lecture on the times and its duties," and that "on the parable of the ten virgins," are of this sort. With small exceptions, they are excellent; and, taken apart from his theory, may be read with profit. The feelings therefore with which I regard the man, are as mingled as his writings. I attribute much that is censurable in him to the influences under which he has lived. He was, as I understand, a respectable farmer; and during the leisure which God grants the farmer at times to enjoy, he applied himself for about seventeen years to the study of the Holy Scriptures, and especially the prophecies. In doing so he did well, so far as the naked fact extends; and if he had been brought up in the sober-minded habits of a Churchman, he would have contented himself with applying to his clergyman or his bishop to unravel difficulties, and "in patience and comfort of God's holy Word," would have gone on in his Christian course, quietly and rejoicing. But the fatal licentiousness of private judgment, and the rash contempt for God's insti-

tutions which are working such mischief in our country, have prompted him to run without being sent, and to become the founder of a short-lived sect, instead of a lively stone in the Temple of God's building.

When time shall have proved to him that his theory is wrong, and the excitement shall have passed away with the dream which has occasioned it, I cannot but think that he will look back with bitter remorse on his present career, and shudder at the thought of the awful responsibility which he has heaped upon himself. The amount of the evils which his rash intrusion upon the ministry has occasioned, what man can calculate? How many, under the agonies of despair, have committed suicide! How many are now in the cells of a mad-house! How many have been led to forsake their honest callings, and impoverish themselves, and ruin the happiness of their families! How many "unstable souls" have been so "shaken in mind," as to forsake the noiseless path of religious duty to run after a phantom by which they have been bewildered and affrighted! How many have been made to scoff at God's Word, by the pitiable ignorance of a rash expounder! How many have joined in the sneer and the laugh, and have thus made shipwreck of the faith through which alone they can be saved! How many enthusiasts, wrought up into present frenzy, when convinced that they have been deceived, will, instead of repenting, be led to deny the Lord that bought them! Alas! who can tell?—The Lord God of gods—the Lord God of gods—he knoweth. Almighty God in his wise providence can bring good out of the extremities of ill. The very excesses which make Holy Faith to become faint, and the angelic countenance of Hope to be darkened, and tender Charity to weep

and mourn, may lead, under God's guidance, to their final strength, and brilliancy, and joy. The very tossings of the tempest around them, may lead wise and reflecting men to take refuge in the Ark of God's Church, and there to float tranquilly over the heaving Deluge.

APPENDIX.

THE deceit occasioned by the miscalculations of Mr. Miller will be ephemeral; but not so the consequences, whether for good or evil; for these will of necessity be more permanent; and like the coming itself of our divine Saviour, are set for the fall and the resurrection of many who profess and call themselves Christians. They will vary, therefore, according to the several classes of individuals on whom the present excitement operates.

As to the disappointed Enthusiast or profane Scoffer, it would be useless to offer any remarks. Nothing which can here be said will be likely to reduce the one to reason or the other to serious reflection. But with regard to the truly religious portion of the community, it is greatly to be hoped that their attention will be roused to the importance of a more extended, and patient, and careful attention to the prophetic portions of Holy Scripture. For the successful study of the prophecies a distinct and accurate knowledge of dates is necessary. But on this very point most readers labor under great embarrassments. There are but few great libraries in the United States to which the Clergy and other learned and intelligent persons can have recourse. They are therefore obliged to take up with references to second, third, or fourth-hand compilers of history, whose productions are often of very inferior character. The mistakes of one author are transcribed by another. Errors of the press are accumulated, which can be corrected only by reference to original sources of information. Thus, instead of seeing with their own eyes, the ground on which systems of chronology are built, they

are forced to receive assertions without proof, and decisions originally erroneous are often repeated by reputable authors until they pass for undisputed verities.

It seemed, therefore, to the present writer that he could not present to the religious public a more acceptable present than a succinct view of those original sources of chronological information to which the interpreters of prophecy must have recourse if they wish to proceed in their calculations with certainty and consequent satisfaction. For this purpose he now proposes to consider,

- I. The Chronology of the Book of Judges :
- II. The Chronology of the Kings of Judah and Israel from the division of the Tribes after the death of Solomon to the Babylonish Captivity :
- III. The Chronology of the Assyrian Empire and the Kingdom of Babylon to the Conquest of that City and the transfer of Sovereignty to the Medo-Persian Empire :
- IV. The Medo-Persian Chronology to the subversion of that Empire : and
- V. The Chronology of the four Kingdoms formed after the extinction of the family of Alexander the Great.

In considering these various heads, the simplest and most satisfactory method is to ascertain, in the first place, the extreme limits within which each period is to be comprehended. On this point we must leave nothing to conjecture ; whereas, in adjusting the minor and intervening dates, we may often be obliged to discuss probabilities, and where there is no certainty, to choose between conflicting opinions.

I.—THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE BOOK OF JUDGES.

The extreme limits of this period furnished by clear and definite authorities are, First, the Exodus of the Children of Israel from Egypt ; and Secondly, the fourth year of the reign of Solomon, when he began to build the Temple of the Lord. According to Mr. Miller's calculation, this period embraces 621 years, as follows :

	Years.
The Israelites in the Wilderness	40
The Government of Joshua	25
The Elders who survived him and anarchy	18
Under Chusan Rishathaim	8
“ Othniel the first Judge	40
“ Eglon the King of Moab	18
“ Ehud the second Judge	80
“ Jabin King of Canaan	20
“ Barak the third Judge	40
“ the Midianites	7
“ Gideon the fourth Judge	40
“ Usurpation of Abimelech	3
“ Tola the fifth Judge	23
“ Jair the sixth Judge	22
“ the Philistines	18
“ Jephthah the seventh Judge	6
“ Ibzan the eighth Judge	7
“ Elon the ninth Judge	10
“ Abdon the tenth Judge	8
“ the Philistines	40
“ Eli, High Priest and eleventh Judge	40
“ Samuel the Prophet and twelfth Judge	24
“ Kings—first King, Saul	40
“ second King, David	40
“ fourth year of third King, Solomon	4

621

The only ancient authorities are three : 1. The Hebrew Text. 2. The Greek Translation of the Septuagint. 3. The Jewish Antiquities of Josephus.

SEC. 1. *Hebrew Text*.—The labors of Kennicott and De Rossi have collected and collated an amazing number of manuscripts of the Hebrew Text. Those collated for Kennicott's Bible, and considered by De Rossi as the basis of his own work, were 581. To these he added, in his own library, $479+77=556$, and from other sources 110; making the total of collated manuscripts 1247. In addition to these, De Rossi examined critically more than $240+23=263$ printed editions, the manuscript sources of which are unknown.* A great portion of these manuscripts contain only parts of the Bible, such as the Pentateuch, the Psalms, or the Prophets; but

* De Rossi's library now belongs to the Government of Parma, and the present writer had the gratification of seeing it in 1831.

among them there are at the least 160 manuscripts of the first and second book of Kings. This is probably a greater amount of Critical Testimony than is to be found for any other ancient book in existence except the New Testament; and the variations in the readings of 1 Kings, vi. 1, are so trifling that they hardly deserve to be mentioned. Not one exists affecting the sense. De Rossi takes no notice at all of this verse. The various readings of Kennicott are 18, and are here subjoined; not because they are of any importance, but to let the reader see with his own eyes, if he can read the Hebrew Bible, how great is the integrity of the passage in question in the sacred text.

1 REG. CAP. VI.

בשמים 1. 30, 50, 60, 70, 76, 80, 82, 85, 89, 93, 95, 96, 107, 108, 109, 111, 125, 129, 136, 144, 150, 155, 158, 170, 174, 177, 181, 191, 240, 244, 253, 257, 260, 264, 270, 282. That is, 37 manuscripts out of 163, designated by the above numbers, in the second word of the verse בשמים omit the letter ו. 151. In the fifth word כאת one manuscript omits the letter ו. 100, one manuscript omits the second שנה, the sixth word of the verse, which is a mere pleonasm. 95, 96, 100, two manuscripts omit the ninth word, an evident mistake. 94, 102, 155—הרביעת 19, 82, 85, 170, 172. In the thirteenth word הרביעת which should be written with two yods, three manuscripts omit the first, and five omit the second. 19 בחדש זו one manuscript omits the words “in the month of Zif.” 196 לחדש—בהרש one manuscript reads “to the month” for “in the month.”—זו 178—3, 4, 50, 60, 80, 89, 93, 95, 101, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 125, 129, 136, 150, 158, 174, 181, 187, 195, 196, 223, 224, 240, 244, 246, 251, 253, 257, 260, 614. One manuscript omits the word Zif, and 35 insert a superfluous yod. 93—ה sup. ras. 130. The sixteenth word is omitted by one manuscript, and in another the first letter is written upon an erasure. החדש sup. ras. 112. The seventeenth word is, in another manuscript, written upon an erasure. השני 70, 136. The eighteenth word is in two manuscripts written with a

superfluous yod. למלך 76, 93, 109, 224, 253, 257, 260, 264. The nineteenth word inserts ן between the last two radicals in eight manuscripts; thereby expressing more fully that it is an infinitive verb and not a noun. שלמה. 223. One manuscript omits the name Solomon.—הבית—130 אל הבית 136, 196, 614. Before the word “The House,” three manuscripts insert the sign of the accusative, and one, designing to insert it, writes by mistake a ל for a ת.—ויבן הבית ליהוה. 109. One manuscript omits altogether the phrase, “that he built the house of the Lord.”

There could not be a better specimen of the patient toil and minute research with which these learned critics have examined every word of the Hebrew Scriptures. These labors have been called vain, because they have detected so few variations which affect the sense. But for this very reason, they are of vast importance. They show us with what scrupulous fidelity the Hebrew text has been preserved. Who can doubt for a moment that the sacred historian, in the passage before us, wrote, “And it came to pass in the four hundred and eightieth year after the children of Israel were come out of the land of Egypt in the fourth year of Solomon’s reign over Israel, in the month of Zif, which is the second month, that he built, or began to build the house of the Lord?”

SEC. 2. *The Septuagint translation.* It is remarkable that the Septuagint version, which in general lengthens the several periods of Biblical chronology, shortens the one which we are now considering. To all the readers of Dr. Horne’s valuable Introduction, it must be well known that there are four Standard Texts of the Septuagint; the Complutensian, Aldine, Vatican, and Alexandrian. The first, third, and fourth of these are in the author’s possession. 1. The Complutensian reads as follows: “And it came to pass in the FOUR HUNDRED AND EIGHTIETH YEAR of the Exodus of the children of Israel from Egypt, in the fourth year in the second month when King Solomon was reigning over Israel, that he built the house of the Lord.” We do not know on what manuscript authorities this text was formed; but

we have just reason to suspect that the editors altered the Greek text to make it conform to the Hebrew and Vulgate. 2. The Vatican Text, taken from the celebrated manuscript 1209,* was published at Rome in 1587. It is singularly confused by the interpolation of Chap. V., 17, 18, and Chap. VI. v. 38 awkwardly inserted in the body of Chap. VI. v. 1. "And it came to pass in the FORTIETH AND FOUR HUNDREDTH YEAR of the Exodus of the children of Israel from Egypt, in the fourth year, in the second month when king Salomon was reigning over Israel, and the king commanded that they should take great costly stones for the foundation of the house and unhewn stones. And the sons (servants ?) of Salomon and the sons (servants ?) of Hiram hewed them and laid them. In the fourth year he laid the foundation of the house of the Lord, in the month Zin and the second month. In the eleventh year, in the month Baal, the same is the eighth month, the house was finished as to its whole method and arrangement." 3. The Alexandrian text reads simply as follows: "And it came to pass in the FORTIETH AND FOUR HUNDRETH YEAR of the exodus of the children of Israel from Egypt, in the fourth year, in the second month, when king Salomon was reigning over Israel, that he built the house of (or for) the Lord."

In the splendid Oxford edition of Holmes & Parsons, framed after the manner of Kennicott's edition of the Hebrew text, the Vatican Septuagint is taken as the text, and the variations from it are noted in the columns below. Those portions only are here presented to the reader which have reference to the chronology.

Καὶ ἐγενήθη] καὶ ἐγένετο 19, 56, 93, 108, 144. Compl. *ἐγένετο δὲ* 44. *Καὶ ἐγενήθη, &c. ad fin. com.]* 71. *ἐν τῷς—τετρακοσίοσις]* *ἐν τῷ τεσσαρακοσίοσῳ* 55. *ἐν τῷ τεσσαρακοσῳ]* *ἐν τῷ ογδοηκοσῳ* 19, 56, 93, 246. Compl. *ἐν τῷ ογδοηκοσῳ*

* Through the kindness of the librarian, Monsignor Mai, in 1831, the present writer had an opportunity to examine this beautiful and invaluable manuscript in the Vatican Library. Dr. Wiseman, then Rector of the English College at Rome, and now R. C. Bishop in Birmingham, informed him that preparations were making to publish the whole manuscript. It is greatly to be desired that a facsimile of it should be published like that of the Alexandrian MS., edited by the Rev. H. H. Baber, 1816-1828.

247. It appears, therefore, that five manuscripts have been found, which, like the Complutensian text, read EIGHTIETH instead of FORTIETH year. The presumption is that all the rest agree with the Vatican and Alexandrian recensions, τῷ τριακοσιῳςῳ 247. καὶ τετρακοσιῳςῳ] καὶ τετρακοσιῳςῳ 19. καὶ ἐν τῷ τετρακοσιῳςῳ 64. Slav. Ostrog. ἔτει 1^ο] ἔτη (sic) 106, 107. 236, 242. Cat. Nic. ἔτι (sic infra) 245. νῖῳν Ἰσραήλ] præmitt. των 19, 56, 64, 93, 108, 244, 245, 246. Compl. Ald. Alex.—ἐξ Αἰγύπτου] ἐκ γῆς Αἰγυπτου 93. ἐκ γῆς Αἰγυπτου 108. Compl. ἐν μηνὶ τῷ δευτέρῳ] τῷ 55, 242. Cat. Nic. βασιλεύοντος] τῆς βασιλείας Georg. τῷ βασιλέως Σαλωμῶν] τε Σαλομωντος βασιλεως 56, τε Σολομωντος 246, Σαλωμῶν] Σολομων 82, 106, 107. ἐπὶ τὸν] τὸν II, XI, 52, 55, 74, 106, 107, 120, 121, (123 ut videtur) 134, 236, 243, 244, 245, 246. Cat. Nic. Origen licit. ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραήλ] ἐπὶ Ἰερουσαλήμ καὶ ὠκοδόμη τὸν οἶκον τῷ Κυρίῳ 242. Ἰσραήλ] + καὶ ὠκοδομήσε τὸν οἶκον Κυρίου 19 + eadem, omisso καὶ, Arm. 1. Arm. Ed. + καὶ ὠκοδομεῖ τὸν οἶκον τῷ Κυρίῳ 44, 52, 74, 92, 106, 107, 120, 134, 144, 158, 236, 243, 244, 246. Alex. Cat. Nic. + καὶ ὠκοδομήσε τὸν οἶκον τῷ Κυρίῳ 93, 108, 121. Compl. Slav. Mosq. + eadem, omisso καὶ, Georg. Slav. Ostrog. + καὶ ὠκοδόμη (sic) τὸν οἶκον τῷ Κυρίῳ 245, &c.

This careful revision of the Greek text shows, I think, indubitably, that the reading 440, must be received as the true reading of that translation. Other inferences might be drawn affecting the character in general of the version; but these I omit, because they are not necessarily connected with the present object.

All the other ancient versions, the Chaldee Targum of Jonathan, the Syriac, the Arabic, and the Latin [version] of St. Jerome, read with the Hebrew text FOUR HUNDRED AND EIGHTIETH.

SEC. 3. *The Jewish Antiquities of Josephus.* The character of this excellent historian is so well established for accuracy with regard to all events in and near his own times, that very great deference must be paid to his authority. Yet this deference must be confined within proper bounds; and it is with a view of showing these bounds that I proceed to give his testimony concerning the period in question. It occurs in the third

chapter of the eighth book of the Antiquities, and is as follows: "Solomon began the building of the Temple in the fourth year of his reign, in the second month, which the Macedonians call Artemisium, but the Hebrews Iar (I-yar), 592 years after the Exodus of the Israelites from Egypt, 1020 years after the departure of Abraham from Mesopotamia into the land of Canaan, 1440 years after the Deluge. So that from the creation of Adam until Solomon built the Temple, there had been completed in the whole 3102 years. That was the eleventh year of the reign of Hiram in Tyre; and from the building of Tyre until the building of the Temple there had passed 240 years."—*Fl. Josephi Opera, cura Oberthur. Tom. 1, p. 864.*

There are but three possible ways of accounting for this difference. Either the Hebrew text of 1 Kings vi. 1, has been changed since the time of Josephus, or he must have departed from it through ignorance, or from design. It is hardly possible that the text can have been changed. The Chaldee Targum of Jonathan Ben Uzziel, agrees with the present reading, and is older than the time of Josephus; and if any change had taken place, certainly in the vast variety of manuscripts and versions brought together from various parts of the world, there would have been some disagreement. The only disagreement which has been discovered is that of the Septuagint; and so far from being in favor of Josephus, the Greek version departs still more widely from him.

We can hardly attribute his differing from the Hebrew text to ignorance. As a priest he must have been familiar with the Bible; and his history contains internal evidence of his having studied it with the greatest attention. It follows, then, that he has added designedly 112 years to the computation of the sacred historian. Now why was this alteration?

If Josephus were perfectly consistent in his dates, the answer would be much more difficult. But he is not consistent; and this we must now proceed to show.

If from the Creation to the building of the Temple was only 3102 years, and from the Deluge to the building of the Temple was 1440 years, then ($3102 - 1439 = 1663$)

the Deluge took place in the year of the world 1663, a difference of seven years only from the chronology of the Hebrew text. But in *Antiq. Jud.*, Lib. 1. c. 3. s. 3, Josephus says, "This calamity (the Deluge) took place in the 600th year of Noah's age, in the second month, which is called by the Macedonians *Dius*, and by the Hebrews *Marsuan* (*Marchesvan*). This period was 2656 years from the first man *Adam*."—*Ed. Oberthur*. Tom. 1. p. 26. According to the chronology of the Hebrew Bible, the Deluge took place A. M. 1656. Here, therefore, Josephus adds 1000 years instead of seven, as in *Antiq.*, Lib. viii. c. 3.

Nor is this the only inconsistency. In the succeeding section of this chapter (*A. J.*, Lib. 1. c. 3. s. 4) Josephus enumerates the generations of the antediluvian patriarchs in the line of Seth, and their ages. I place the Jewish-Hebrew, Samaritan-Hebrew, and the Septuagint calculations, side by side with his, that the reader may see the diversity.*

Here, instead of 2656 he makes the date of the Deluge A. M. 2256. Thus we have three different dates for that event.

It will not be difficult now to trace the steps by which he arrived at his dates.

The Septuagint, in recounting the ages of the first seven antediluvian patriarchs, uniformly and systematically differs from the Hebrew text, adding one hundred years before the birth of each, and subtracting one hundred after each birth, so as to make the whole number of years of each patriarch the same as in the Hebrew. In this Josephus follows the Greek version, evidently from the same motive—that is, a desire to lengthen out the antediluvian period. But in the ages of the eighth and ninth patriarchs the Septuagint has committed a blunder which effectually detects the falsehood of its chronology. This will be seen by comparing its statements with those of the Hebrew text. According to the Septuagint, Methuselah, when he begat Lamech, was 167 years old, and Lamech, when he begat Noah, was 188

* See next page.

No	Names of the Antediluvian Patriarchs.	Jewish-Hebrew Comp.			Samaritan-Hebrew Comp.			Septuagint Computation.			Josephus.		
		Age of each at the birth of his son and succ'ss'r	Length of life after the birth of his son.	Whole No. of years which each lived.	Age of each at the birth of his son and succ'ss'r	Length of life after the birth of his son.	Whole No. of years which each lived.	Age of each at the birth of his son and succ'ss'r	Length of life after the birth of his son.	Whole No. of years which each lived.	Age of each at the birth of his son and succ'ss'r	Length of life after the birth of his son.	Whole No. of years which each lived.
1	Adam	130	800	930	130	800	930	230	700	930	230	700	930
2	Seth	105	807	912	105	807	912	205	707	912	205	707	912
3	Enos	90	815	905	90	815	905	190	715	905	190	715	905
4	Cainan	70	840	910	70	840	910	170	740	910	170	740	910
5	Mahalaheel	65	830	895	65	830	895	165	730	895	165	730	895
6	Jared	162	800	962	62	785	847	162	800	962	162	800	962
7	Enoch	65	360	365	65	300	365	165	200	365	165	200	365
8	Methuselah	187	782	969	67	653	720	167	802	969	187	782	969
9	Lamech	182	595	777	53	600	653	188	565	753	182	595	777
10	Noah to and after the Deluge.	600	350	950	600	350	950	600	350	950	600	350	950
	Epoch of the Deluge.	1656			1307			2242			2256		

years old. According to this statement ($167 + 188 + 600 = 955$) the Deluge took place in the 955th year of Methuselah. On the other hand, according to the Hebrew, Methuselah was 187 when Lamech was born, and Lamech 182 when Noah was born. Consequently ($187 + 182 + 600 = 969$) the Deluge took place in or at the close of the 969th year of Methuselah. Now, according to the Septuagint as well as the Hebrew, Methuselah lived 969 years, whereas according to their statement the Flood happened in his 955th year. ~~Therefore he must have lived fourteen~~ years after the Flood, contrary to the express words of Moses—Gen. vii. 13. According to the Hebrew calculation Methuselah died just before the Flood came! This blunder did not escape the notice of Josephus, and therefore with regard to Methuselah and Lamech he adopted the Hebrew calculation. Consequently his antediluvian chronology is a mere patchwork, made out of parcels of the Hebrew and Greek computations.

We shall find similar inconsistencies in the postdiluvian periods. In the passage concerning the building of the Temple, Josephus says that it was 1440 years after the Deluge, and 1020 years after the departure of Abraham from Mesopotamia into the land of Canaan. The difference between those two numbers ($1440 - 1019 = 421$) gives the length of the period between the Deluge and the calling of Abraham. We will now see how the same author represents the length of this period in detail. In Ant. Jud., Lib. 1. c. vi. s. 5, he thus expresses himself: "I will now speak of the Hebrews. Ragavus was born the son of Phalecus the son of Eberus. His son was Serugus, to whom was born a son Nachores. His son was Tharrus; and he became the father of Abramus, who was the tenth [in descent] from Noah, and was born in the 292d year after the Deluge. For Tharrus begat Abramus in his 70th year. Nachores begat Tharrus when he himself was at the age of 120 years. Nachores was born to Serugus about his hundred and thirty-second year. Ragavus had Serugus when he was a hundred and thirty years old; and at the same age Phalecus had Ragavus. Eberus begat Phalecus in his hundred and thirty-fourth year; and he himself was begotten by Salus when the latter was a hundred and

thirty years old. Him Arphaxades begat about the hundred and thirty-fifth year of his age; and Arphaxades was the son of Semus [Shem] and was born twelve years [ἔτη δύο καὶ δέκα] after the Deluge. Abramus had [two] brothers, Nachores and Aranes. Of these, Aranes died among the Chaldæans, in the city called Ure of the Chaldæans, leaving a son Lot, and [two] daughters, Sarra and Melcha. His sepulchre is shown even to this day. Nachores married Melcha, and Abramus Sarra, the daughters of their brother. Tharrus having an aversion to Chaldæa on account of the mournful loss of Aranes, they all removed to Charran of Mesopotamia, where Tharrus died and was buried at the age of 205 years."—Fl. Josephi Opera, Ed. Oberthur. Tom. 1. p. 48.

It is unnecessary to detain the reader on the difference of these names. They are merely Greek representations of Hebrew names; they agree for the most part with the Septuagint; and are sufficiently near to the Hebrew, as represented in the English Bible, to be intelligible. I proceed therefore to give, as before, a tabular view of the chronology of this period according to the Hebrew text, the Septuagint version, and Josephus; merely in advance calling the reader's attention to the interpolated postdiluvian Caïnan in the Septuagint version, concerning whose existence Josephus and the Hebrew Bible are equally silent.*

It will now be seen that in the passage, A. J., Lib. 1. c. vi. s. 5, Josephus asserts the general fact of Abraham's birth in the 292d year after the Deluge, following what he conceived to be the computation of the Hebrew text. Whereas in the details which immediately follow his general assertion, the Septuagint chronology is embraced, excepting only the period of the birth of Arphaxad, the interpolated Caïnan, and the age of Nahor at the birth of Terah, which he reduces from 179 to 120. There is also a transposition of the ages of Reu and Serug which produces no change in the sum total. How can this inconsistency be accounted for in a writer of such mental powers and such general accuracy? I cannot help thinking that he is not responsible for these

* See opposite page.

	Names of the postdiluvian Patriarchs, descending from Noah and Sh'm in the line of Arphaxad.	Jewish-Hebrew Comp.			Samaritan-Heb. Comp.			Septuagint Computation.							Josephus.		
		Age of each at the birth of his son and successor.	Length of life after the birth of his son.	Whole No. of years which each lived.	Age of each at the birth of his son and successor.	Length of life after the birth of his son.	Whole No. of years which each lived.	According to the Alexandrian and Vatican texts, exhibiting a variation of 100 years.							Age of each at the birth of his son.	Length of life after the birth of his son.	Whole No. of years which each lived.
1	Shem two years after the Flood begat Arphaxad.	100	500	600				100	100	500	500	600	600				
2	Arphaxad born after the Flood.	2 35	403	438	2 135	303	438	2 135 130	2 135 130	430 330 330	400 330 330	565 460 460	535 460 460		12 135		
Cainan																	
3	Salah	30	403	433	130	303	433	135	135	430	400	565	535		130		
4	Eber	34	430	464	134	270	404	130	130	330	270	460	460		134		
5	Peleg	30	209	239	130	109	239	134	130	370	209	504	404		130		
6	Reu	32	207	239	132	107	239	130	130	209	209	460	339		130		
7	Serug	30	200	230	130	100	230	132	132	207	207	339	339		130		
8	Nahor	29	119	148	79	69	148	130	130	200	200	330	330		132		
9	Terah	70		205	70	145	145	79	179	129	125	208	304		120		
10	Abram, Nahor, Haran.	292			942			70	70			205	205		70		205
						Age of the inter- polated Cainan.		1072 130	1172 130						993		
								942	1042								

contradictions; and that they are in fact the work of bungling transcribers, under the influence of the Septuagint version. Be that as it may, here the contradictions are, and they are not the only ones, as we shall now proceed to show.

In Ant. Jud., Lib. 1. c. vii, s. 1, Josephus states that "Abramus left Chaldæa when he was seventy-five years old; God having ordered him to remove into Canaan."—Opera ut sup., p. 50. In this he agrees with the Hebrew text and the Septuagint, (Gen. xii. 4), save that they say more definitely, instead of Chaldæa, that Abram departed out of Haran, or Charran, the place to which Terah migrated from Ur of the Chaldees. But how is this consistent with the passage, Ant. Jud., Lib. viii. cap. iii., where he says that Solomon began to build the Temple 1020 years after the departure of Abram from Mesopotamia into the land of Canaan? The distance of time, according to that computation, from the Deluge to the departure of Abram, was 421 years. But if he was born 292 years after the Deluge, then ($292 + 75 = 367$) he departed from Charran in the 367th year. Here is a difference of 54 years. I say nothing of the 993 years in the table.

But there is an error in the statement of 292 years, into which others as well as Josephus have inadvertently fallen. The Hebrew states (Gen. xi. 26), that "Terah lived seventy years and begat Abram, Nahor and Haran." The mode of expression is analogous to that of Gen. v. 32. Noah was 500 years old, and Noah begat Shem, Ham and Japheth. The sons are named in both cases in inverted order. Japheth is expressly said (Gen. x. 21) to have been the elder brother; and it is clear that Shem was not born till two years after him; for he was one hundred years old at the birth of Arphaxad (Gen. xi. 10) two years after the Flood. In like manner Haran was the eldest brother, and was born when his father Terah was seventy years old. But Abram, the youngest son, was born sixty years later, because he did not remove from Charran till his father was dead, (Acts vii. 4), and he was then seventy-five years old. Consequently he was born ($205 - 75 = 130$)

when Terah was 130 years old. Josephus says that Sarah, as well as Milcah, was the daughter of Haran. This is very probable; and she was only ten years younger than Abraham (Gen. xvii. 17). It is evident, therefore, that the true date of Abraham's birth, according to the Jewish-Hebrew text, is $(292+60)$ the year 352 after the Deluge; and consequently his departure into the land of Canaan was $(352+75)$ in the year after the Deluge 427, which is six years later than the date assigned to it by Josephus (Ant. Jud., Lib. viii. c. iii.) And it is a curious confirmation of the truth of these remarks, that if from 3102, the age of the world according to Josephus, when Solomon began to build the Temple, you take 1440, the number of years of his numeration from the Deluge, there will remain, as the epoch of the Deluge, 1662; from which subtract 1656, the Hebrew date of the Deluge, and you have exactly the six years wanting to correct the computation of time from the Deluge to the departure of Abraham. So if you take from A. M. 3102 the sum of $(1020-1)$ 1019 years, you arrive at A. M. 2083 for the departure of Abraham from Charan, which is exactly the computation of the Hebrew text.

Again: Josephus (Ant. Jud., Lib. ii. c. xv. s 2) says of the Children of Israel, "They left Egypt in the month Xanthicus, on the fifteenth day of the moon's age, 430 years after the coming of our progenitor Abraham into the land of Canaan, and 215 years after the migration of Jacob into Egypt. Moses was then 80 years old, and his brother Aaron three years older."—Opera ed. Oberthur. Tom. i. p. 218. This agrees with both the Jewish and Samaritan-Hebrew text and the Septuagint version (Exodus xii. 40, 41). Therefore $430+2083$ gives A. M. 2513 as the year of the Exodus. Now if you take $592-1$, or 591, from 3102, the remainder, 2511, would be the age of the world at the Exodus, being within two years of the true date. The testimony of Josephus, therefore, when properly weighed and adjusted, becomes a very powerful auxiliary of the Jewish-Hebrew text.

These remarks will serve as an introduction to the

following concise view of the dates established by that text, in the interval between the calling of Abraham and the Exodus of the Children of Israel.

	A. M.	From the Deluge.
Abraham called to depart from Haran into Canaan after his father's death, when he was 75 years old.	2083	427
Ishmael born when Abraham was 86.—Gen. xvi., 16. A. J. Lib. i., c. 10.	2094	438
Isaac born when he was 100 and Sarah 90.—Gen. xxi., 5. A. J. Lib. i., c. 12, s. 2.	2108	452
Sarah dies, aged 127, when Isaac was 37.—Gen. xxiii., 1. A. J. Lib. i., c. 14.	2145	489
Isaac marries Rebecca when he was 40.—Gen. xxv., 20. A. J. Lib. i., c. 16.	2148	492
Esau and Jacob born when Isaac was 60.—Gen. xxv., 26. Josephus wrongly places their birth after Abram's death. A. J. Lib. i., c. 18.	2168	512
Abraham dies at the age of 175.—Gen. xxv., 7. A. J. Lib. i., c. 18.	2183	527
Esau marries when he is 40 and Isaac 100.—Gen. xxvi., 34. A. J. Lib. i., c. 18.	2208	552
Isaac dies at the age of 180, when Esau and Jacob were 120. Josephus (A. J. Lib. i., c. 22) makes the age of Isaac, when he died, 185. But the Septuagint agrees with the Hebrew.—Genesis xxxv., 29.	2288	632
Jacob goes down into Egypt 10 years after, when he was 130 (Gen. xlvii., 9). Joseph was then 39.—Gen. xli., 46, 47; xlv. 6. A. J. Lib. ii., c. 6, s. 1; c. vii., s. 6.	2298	642
Jacob died, having lived in Egypt 17 years, when he was 147.—Gen. xlvii., 28. A. J. Lib. ii., c. 8, s. 1.	2315	659
Joseph died at the age of 110.—Gen. l., 26. A. J. Lib. ii., c. 8, s. 2.	2369	713
Israelites departed from Egypt 215 years after Jacob went thither; 144 years after the death of Joseph; and 430 years after Abraham came from Haran to Canaan.—Exod. xii., 40, 41. A. J. Lib. ii., c. 15, s. 2.	2513	857

For these dates we have express authorities in the Hebrew text. The intervening dates must be adjusted partly by conjecture and partly by computation.

The reader will now be prepared to read with interest the remarks of Eusebius on the difficult chronology from Genesis to the book of Judges.

They are contained in the first part of his *Chronicon*. This long lost work was recovered through the medium of an Armenian translation, and published, to the great joy of the learned world, in 1818.* The whole passage is too long for insertion in this place. I must content myself, therefore, with an abridged view of it, merely to show that Eusebius was perfectly acquainted with all the difficulties, and that he reasoned about them in the fourth century just as we now reason about them in the nineteenth. In justice to myself, however, I must remark, that the observations on the difference between the language of St. Paul, Acts xiii. 20, and the testimony in 1 Kings vi. 1, which occur in the second of the preceding discourses, were written before I had read that part of the *Chronicon* of which I now proceed to give a synopsis.

In the sixteenth chapter of the first part of his *Chronicon*, Eusebius treats of chronology according to the Hebrew method. He refers to the books of Moses and the succeeding Hebrew writers contained in the Bible, to the Jewish history of Josephus, and to the chronological works of Africanus, as his authorities. He then proceeds to speak of the difference between the books of the law in the Jewish and the Samaritan texts. He observes that the characters in which they are written are entirely different; that, by the confession of the Jews themselves, the Samaritan characters are the primitive and genuine; and that, until the change of letters, there

* Two editions of the *Chronicon* of Eusebius, containing different translations, were simultaneously published in 1818; the one at Milan by John Zohrab, a learned Armenian doctor, and Angiolo Mai, afterwards librarian of the Vatican; the other at the Armenian convent of St. Lazarus, near Venice, by the famous Armenian doctor, John Baptist Aucher. The Latin version of the former is the more elegant; that of the latter the more literal. Father Aucher's translation is also accompanied by the Armenian text, and enriched with critical notes. The second part of the *Chronicon* had been preserved by St. Jerom's translation; but of the first part only a few disjointed fragments were known before 1818. These had been collected and put together by Joseph Scaliger, but were justly suspected of interpolation, either by succeeding Greek writers, or by the extraordinarily fertile imagination and dogmatic positiveness of the strong-minded and learned, but supercilious editor.

had been no variation between them. At present, the difference with regard to chronology is great. The Septuagint translation, also, made under Ptolemy Philadelphus, differs very greatly from the Jewish-Hebrew text. It differs not so much from the Samaritan-Hebrew, excepting before the Deluge. From the Deluge to the age of Abraham, the Greek and the Samaritan agree; but this assertion, as we shall soon see, must be taken with some limitation. He then gives successively the Septuagint, Jewish and Samaritan computations of the period preceding the Deluge, and concerning the difficulty respecting the age of Methuselah, remarks that some copies of the Septuagint agree with the Hebrew and Samaritan in placing his death just at the commencement of the Deluge. The Jewish computation, he observes, varies from the Septuagint version 586 years. The Samaritan makes the whole period before the Deluge 1307 years, and thus differs from the Hebrew 349 years, and from the Septuagint translation 935 years. It is evident, therefore, that the three computations of the antediluvian chronology were as much at variance in the beginning of the fourth century, as they are now in the nineteenth.

The postdiluvian chronology begins alike, according to the Septuagint, the Hebrew, and the Samaritan, by the birth of Arphaxad, two years after the Flood. Eusebius omits the interpolated Caïnan, and makes the Septuagint agree with the Samaritan text in placing the birth of Salah 135 years after the birth of Arphaxad, or 137 years after the Deluge. He also places the birth of Abraham, as Josephus did, at the end of the 70th year of Terah or Tharra. He therefore states that, according to the Jewish Hebrew text, the period from the Deluge to the first year of Abraham is 292 years; and according to the Septuagint and the Samaritan-Hebrew, 942 years. This last assertion shows that the copy of the Septuagint version used by Eusebius, agreed with the Alexandrian text, and not with the Vatican, as the reader will see by the comparative table. For if the Vatican be the most correct text, then there was a difference of 100 years in the two computations. The Samaritan-Hebrew

and the Alexandrian Septuagint differ from the Jewish Hebrew, 650 years; the Vatican Septuagint, 750 years. According to the Samaritan text, Abraham was actually born in the 70th year of Terah; for Terah is there said to have died when he was 145 years old, and Abraham was $(70+75=145)$ 75 years old when he removed into Canaan, immediately after his father's death.

Eusebius goes on to assign his reasons for preferring the Samaritan-Hebrew to the Jewish-Hebrew text.

1. This text, by assigning a longer period before the procreation of each son, accords better with the Septuagint version which he calls our reading (*τη παρ' ἡμῶν ἀναγνώσει*)—meaning, as I suppose, the reading of the Eastern, or Greek Church, where the Septuagint version then was, and still is, read in churches as the received text. But this reason of Eusebius can apply only to the postdiluvian chronology; the antediluvian being nearer to the Jewish-Hebrew text and Josephus, and more easily reconciled with them than with the Septuagint.

2. It is the oldest Hebrew text, and as such has the greater authority, having been carefully preserved by the Samaritans.

3. It accords better with the gradual diminution of the term of human life; for how can it be accounted for that the most ancient, whose lives were longer than the lives of their posterity, should beget children at an earlier age than they?

Eusebius, therefore, prefers the antediluvian computation of the Septuagint, excepting the period after Jared. The Samaritan-Hebrew he thinks has erred in the antediluvian series, and in that only; while the Septuagint version was made from the oldest and best copies, was sanctioned by the Apostles and first disciples of our Saviour, and has been universally received by the Christian Church. He then states again the several computations from Adam to the 70th year of Terah, inclusive, as being the first year of Abraham, and then says that all agree in making the distance of time from the birth of Abraham to the Exodus of the Children of Israel under Moses 505 years, viz.: 75 years

to his call, and 430 from his call to the Exodus. He then adds the following computation of the generations between Abraham and Moses, in the line of Levi:

1. Abraham	when he begat Isaac	was aged	100	years.
2. Isaac	"	Jacob	"	60 "
3. Jacob	"	Levi	"	86 "
4. Levi	"	Cahath or Cohath,	46	"
5. Cahath or Cohath		Amram	"	63 "
6. Amram	"	Moses	"	70 "
7. Moses	when he led the Children of Israel out of Egypt	- - - - -	80	"
			505	"

Therefore the distance of time from Adam to the Exodus was,

According to the Septuagint version	- - -	3689	years
According to the Samaritan-Hebrew	- - -	2753	"
According to the Jewish-Hebrew	- - -	2453	"*

Having thus carried down the chronology to the Exodus, Eusebius enters upon the difficult subject of the chronology in the Book of Judges. He states, in the first place, that Africanus has greatly erred in extending the period from the Exodus to the building of the Temple to 744 years without the least authority. For if from Abraham to David there were, in the line of Judah, 14 generations (Matt. i. 2—vi. 17); if the ninth existed under Moses; if Naasson, the son of Aminadab, who was then prince of the tribe of Judah, was one of

* It has already been remarked that Eusebius used a copy of the Septuagint which agreed with the Alexandrian text; for the Vatican text differs from the Alexandrian 100 years in the interval between the Deluge and the Exodus. Eusebius also committed the error of supposing that the birth of Abraham, according to the Jewish-Hebrew, was to be placed after the 70th year of Terah, and not, as it should be, after the 130th year of Terah, or 60 years later. This mistake being corrected, and the variations of the Alexandrian and Vatican texts taken into the account, the several computations of time, from the Creation to the Exodus, will be as follows, omitting the interpolated Caïnan:

	Years.
According to the Alexandrian Septuagint (2242+942+505)	3689
According to the Vatican Septuagint (2242+1042+505) -	3789
According to the Samaritan-Hebrew text (1307+942+505)	2754
According to the Jewish-Hebrew text (1656+292+60+505)	2513

those who came out of Egypt and died in the wilderness; then it will be seen that the five generations from Naasson to David, inclusive, could not have filled so great a number of years. For—1. Naasson begat Salmon; 2. Salmon, Boaz; 3. Boaz, Obed; 4. Obed, Jesse; and 5. Jesse, David. How could five generations take up 700 years? This would give 140 years to each generation, which no man in his sound mind could allow. Moses lived but 120 years, and Joshua 110; and before them, Joseph died at the age of 110. Jacob also lived, he says, 145; it should be 147.

But it may be argued that Clemens reckons from Joshua to the building of the Temple 574 years, which may be known from his first Book;* and the Apostle Paul, in the Acts of the Apostles, in addressing the Jews, speaks of 450 years under the power of the Judges until Samuel the prophet (Acts xiii. 20); so that the Apostle makes the years after Joshua 534, as follows:—

Whole time of the Judges until Samuel	-	-	450
The years of Samuel combined with those of Saul	-		40
The years of the reign of David	-	-	40
The first four years of the reign of Solomon	-	-	4
			534
Add to these, Moses in the Wilderness	-	-	40
And allow for Joshua, the son of Nun (Nave)	-		27
			601

And the whole sum amounts to six hundred years.

* The passage here referred to by Eusebius is in the Stromata of Clemens Alexandrinus, Lib. 1, § 21. "There are, therefore, from Moses to the age of Solomon, as some say, 595 years; or, as others say, 576. But if any one shall calculate with the 450 years from Joshua to David, the 40 years in which Moses commanded, and the other 80 years which Moses lived before the Exodus of the Children of Israel from Egypt, and shall add to these the reign of David, 40 years, he will make the sum total 610 years. But our chronography proceeds more accurately if, to the 523 years and 7 months to the death of David, any one add the 120 years of Moses and the 40 of Solomon; for he will then make the sum total to the death of Solomon 683 years and 7 months."—Clem. Alex. Opera, Ed. Potter, tom. 1, 386. What, then, is the calculation of Clemens? From 683 years and 7 months, deduct the age of Moses at the time of the

Now, if you divide this period into the five generations, from Naasson to David, it is manifest that you distribute to each more than 115 years before they begat children, which is absurd.

What remains, then, but to have recourse to the authority of the Book of Kings? That strongly affirms that the whole time from the Exodus to Solomon and the building of the Temple was 440 years; though the Hebrew copy has 480 years. The Jewish doctors assert that, according to accurate calculation, this period must be comprised within 480 years. They do not reckon separately those years in which the Gentiles are said to have ruled over the people; but they reduce the government of the people to the number of the Judges, attributing to the same period the incursions of the foreign tyranny. In this way, say they, and this only, can the 480 years be properly adjusted. *I cannot think, moreover, that the holy Apostle meant to set forth any system of chronology, or by any definite decision to establish any exact computation of time, when he stated the aforesaid number of years. He could not lay aside the teaching of the word of salvation to devote himself to questions of chronology; but he seems to have used the common reading of the book of Judges.* Whereas, the Book of Kings has evidently transmitted the exact period from the Exodus to Solomon, viz.: 440 or 480 years. The opinion which attributes to each of the aforesaid five generations 120 years before the procreation of their children, is entirely opposite to truth and credibility. Deducting from 480 years the 40 years under Moses in the wilderness, and the four years of Solomon, there remain 436 years to the death of David, which being divided into the five generations, will allow to each man the age of 85 years (87) before the procreation of his son. Any one who attentively examines, will see that this is true;

Exodus, 80 years, and for the reign of Solomon after his fourth year when he began to build the Temple, 36 years, and you have $683 - (80 + 36 = 116) = 577$ or 577 years 7 months, as the time between the Exodus and the foundation of the Temple, not 574 years, as above stated by Eusebius. But perhaps some errors may have crept into the copies.

more especially if he considers the circumstances of David's birth; for Jesse was an old man when David, who was his eighth child, was born.

But the subject will be rendered still more clear by an argument derived from the book of Judges itself. Eusebius then quotes Judges xi. 25, 26; after which he proceeds thus: By these words Jephthah teaches that from the time of Moses and Balak the son of Zippor to his age, 300 years had passed away. But if the years in which the people were oppressed by foreign power be counted separately, the time will greatly exceed 300 years. Whereas, if any one reckons only the years in which the Judges ruled, the time from Moses to Jephthah will be found to be 300 years; and thus the testimony of Jephthah is confirmed. Our chronology may therefore be thus explained:

Moses, years of, - - - - -	40
Joshua, years of, - - - - -	27
Foreign servitude, and Godoniel, or Othniel, the Judge, - -	80
Foreign servitude, and Deborah and Barak - -	40
Gideon, years of, - - - - -	40
Abimelech, years of, - - - - -	3
Thola, or Tola, years of, - - - - -	22
Jair, years of, - - - - -	22
Foreign servitude, and years of Jephthah the Judge, -	6
Sebegon, or Ibzan, years of, - - - - -	7
Labdon, or Abdon, years of, - - - - -	8
Foreign servitude, and Sampson, years of, - -	20
[In that time was carried on the Trojan war.]	
Heli, or Eli, years of, - - - - -	40
Samuel and Saul, years of, - - - - -	40
David, years of, - - - - -	40
Years of Solomon, until the building of the Temple -	4

439

Total from Moses and the Exodus from Egypt to the building of the Temple, 480 years.

From the Exodus to the building of Solomon's Temple -	480
From the birth of Abraham to the Exodus - - -	505
From the Deluge to the first year of Abraham - -	942
From Adam to the Deluge - - - - -	2242

4169

"Total from Adam to Solomon and the building of the Temple, 4150 years."—Eus. Cæs. Chron. Can., Lib. i. c. 16. Ed. Milan, pp. 49-78. Ed. Venice, tom. 1. pp. 106-172.

My object has been faithfully to condense the argument of Eusebius, not to point out his defects or correct his mistakes. But it may be well to mention here that in the foregoing catalogue of Judges, he has omitted Elon the Zebulonite, who judged Israel 10 years, and whose name occurs between Ibzan and Abdon. The difference also of the sum total shows, that the object of Eusebius was to reconcile the chronology of the Book of Judges with the shorter computation of the Septuagint, though he appears to waver between that and the longer computation of the Hebrew.

The reader will now have seen that all Mr. Miller's computations were considered and obviated more than 1500 years before he was born. I proceed now to show the manner in which the chronology of the book of Judges has been adjusted in modern times. For this purpose I shall here insert a letter, written before Mr. Miller's scheme had seen the light, to a young lady who had asked my assistance in the prosecution of these historical studies.

Hartford, August 15, 1835.

MY DEAR MISS S*****,

I begged Dr. Kemper to acknowledge for me the receipt of your favor of July 27th, and to explain to you why I could not immediately answer it. The questions you proposed had relation to a very difficult part of Chronology: and of course it was impossible to give them a hasty answer. I proceed now without further preface to relieve you from your difficulties, as far as it is in my power.

Assuming A. M. 2083 as the date of the calling of Abraham, which was, if I remember correctly, the period at which we had arrived in our examination, Gen. xi. 32, xii. 4, compared with Acts vii. 4, when Terah was dead and Abraham was 75 years old, I proceed as follows:

From the calling of Abraham to the Exodus of the children of Israel was 430 years, [Exod. xii. 40, 41, compared with Gal. iii. 17,] $2083 + 430 = 2513$ h. Moses was then 80 and Aaron 83. Exod. vii. 7. The wanderings of the children of Israel in the Wilderness 40 years, the death of Moses at the age of 120, the appointment of Joshua and the entrance into the promised land are all fixed by Deut. i. 3, xxxiv. 7, Joshua i. 2, and bring us to A. M. 2553. How long Joshua ruled Israel we cannot tell from the Scriptures; for though his age, when he died, is mentioned (Josh. xxiv. 29) as being 110 years, yet we know not how old he was when Moses died. We must therefore look forward in the sacred history to some certain date, that we may circumscribe, within as short a space as possible, the period of conjectural arrangement.

According to 1 Kings vi. 1, the foundation of Solomon's Temple was laid in the 480th year after the Exodus, i. e. $2513 + 480 = 2993$, and this was the 4th year of Solomon. His reign, then, commenced $2993 - 4 =$ A. M. 2989, and this consequently was the year of David's death, 1 Kings ii. 10. And as David's whole reign was 40 years, 1 Kings ii. 11, he began to reign A. M. 2949, the date, consequently, of Saul's death, 2 Sam. ii. 4. Saul reigned 40 years, Acts xiii. 21. He began to reign, therefore, A. M. 2909, and the difference between this date and 2553, the date of the entrance into the promised land, gives 356 years as the whole period of Joshua, of the anarchy which followed his death, and of the Judges.

After the entrance into the promised land, the first passover was kept in the plains of Jericho on the 14th day of the first month of the 41st year from the Exodus. On the 15th day the children of Israel ate of the old corn of the land, and the manna ceased, Josh. v. 10, 11, 12, xi. 18. Joshua made war a long time, but finally took the whole land and gave it for an inheritance unto Israel, and the land rested from war (v. 23), and at this time Joshua was old and stricken in age, (xiii. 1). The date of this division may be gathered from the following passages. (Numbers x. 11, 12.) On the 20th day of the 2d month of the 2d year after leaving Egypt, i. e. after the celebration of the 1st anniversary or 2d passover, (ix. 1, 2, 3, comp. with 11), the Israelites journeyed from the wilderness of Sinai to that of Paran; and from Paran (xii. 3) the men, of whom Caleb was one, were sent to explore the promised land. At that time (Joshua xiv. 7) Caleb was 40 years old; and when the division of the land took place he was 85. If, then, he was 40 at the beginning of the 2d year after the Exodus, he was 85 at the beginning of the 47th year after the Exodus. The conquest, then, of the promised land, occupied 6 years, and on the 7th year the land had rest. This was the 1st Sabbatical year—beginning at the vernal equinox, A. M. 2559. At this time Joshua was old and stricken in years, Josh. xiii. 1. But his death could not have followed two years after, as Archbishop Usher supposes; for it is said (Josh. xxiii. 1) that a long time after the Lord had given rest unto Israel, i. e. the first Sabbatical year, Joshua waxed old, &c., and was going the way of all the earth, (v. 14.) Josephus says, (Antiq., Book v. ch. i. sec. 29), that he lived 110 years, and was captain of the Host, after the death of Moses, 25 years. I see no reason why we should not admit this testimony, and accordingly Sir John Marsham and Blair do admit it, as well as the Bishop of Clogher, in his vindication of the Hebrew Chronology. This will fix the date of his death A. M. 2578, leaving a period of 331 years, to the reign of Saul.

It is this period concerning which there is so much difficulty. If all the years of servitude, of rest, and of the government of the Judges, be considered as successive periods, it will be found that they amount at least to 430 years; even if we include the 20 years of Samson within the forty of the Philistine oppression, the whole of Samuel's administration within the 40 years of Saul, and make no allowance for the elders who outlived Joshua and the period of anarchy spoken of in the last five chapters of the Book of Judges. We are reduced

therefore to the dilemma, either of enlarging the period between the Exodus and the building of the Temple, or of considering some of these periods as contemporaneous.

The first course has been taken by Josephus, (see *Antiq.*, B. viii. ch. 3, § 1, and B. x. ch. 8, § 5;) in both which passages he asserts that from the Exodus to the foundation of the Temple, in the fourth year of Solomon, there were 592 years. This would admit the following computation: Moses 40+Joshua 25+Seniors and time of Anarchy 13+Judges 430+Saul and Samuel 40+David 40+Solomon 4=592.

Not to embarrass the subject, I omit noticing the ancient chronologers, excepting to observe, that they do not agree in their computation of the whole time, although they generally agree with the Bible in the several particulars. When they disagree, the numbers being in general represented by single letters, have probably been corrupted by false readings. Clemens Alexandrinus (*Strom.* B. i.) makes the whole period, at one time, 594, at another, 561; and the *Chronicon Paschale* computes, from the Exodus to the reign of Solomon, 630 years. Petavius, who pleads strongly for an extension of the time, makes a calculation peculiar to himself, fixing the whole period at 520 years.

But to depart from the express declarations of the Bible, beside being liable to many objections of minor importance, appears to me to be a preference of human to divine authority. The passage 1 Kings vi. 1, has no various readings of any importance, and the Targum of Jonathan, and all the versions, excepting the Septuagint, read 480 years. The reading of the Septuagint is 440; but that only increases the difficulty, and Eusebius, who notices the discrepancy between the Hebrew and Greek text, evidently prefers the Hebrew, though he endeavors, by omissions, to contract the space of time to 439 years. Unmoved, therefore, by the reasoning of Petavius, I take the ground which almost all modern chronologers have taken, that the Hebrew text must prescribe the limits of our investigation, and consequently that some of the periods mentioned in the Book of Judges were contemporary.

To adjust the chronology on this basis, two systems, as far as my observation extends, have been adopted. The one is that of Archbishop Usher, first published in 1660, and which has since been generally adopted; the other is that of Sir John Marsham. I shall endeavor to state them both to you as concisely as possible.

Archbishop Usher supposes that the Sacred Historian first computes time by a succession of rests, that is, from one time of repose to another, till after the time of Gideon, and then by a succession of Judges, till the time of Saul, the first king. The following is his scheme as given in his *Chronologia Sacra*, chap. xii.

"The Israelites left Egypt on the fifteenth day of the first month, and (by 2 Chron. iii. 2) on the second day of the second month in the fourth year of Solomon, the foundations of the Temple were laid, 479 years and 17 days, and not 480 full years after the Exodus.

	Y.	M.
I. From the Exodus to the passage of the Jordan, . . .	40	
(Exod. xvi. 35; Deut. ii. 7, viii. 2, xxix. 5; Josh. v. 6; Psal. xcv. 10; Nehem. ix. 21; Amos ii. 10; v. 25; Acts vii. 36, xiii. 18, though Josh. v. 6, in the Greek, has 42.)		
II. From the passage of the Jordan till the end of the wars, and the rest given by Joshua, (Josh. xiv.) . .	6	4
III. From the rest given by Joshua to the rest restored to the land by Othniel, after the victory over Cushan, king of Mesopotamia, . . .	40	
(Jud. iii. 2. In this period, 32 years are allowed for Joshua and the elders, and the anarchy; and eight the time they served Cushan.)		
IV. Thence to the rest restored to the land by Ehud, after the death of Eglon, king of the Moabites, . . .	80	
(Jud. iii. 30.)		
V. Thence to the rest restored to the land by Deborah and Barak, after the defeat of the army of Jabin, king of Canaan, . . .	40	
(Jud. v. 41. In this space 20 years of oppression and Shamgar, iii. 31.)		
VI. Thence to the rest restored to the land by Gideon when he had conquered the Midianites, . . .	40	
VII. Thence to the beginning of the reign of Abimelech, . .	9	2
(This is not expressed in the Scriptures, but collected by subtracting other dates.)		
VIII. Years of Abimelech, Tola, and Jair, . . .	48	
IX. Jephthah, . . .	6	
X. Ibsan, Elon, and Abdon, (7+10+8,) . . .	25	
(Jud. xii. 8—15.)		
XI. Eli and Samson, . . .	40	
XII. Samuel, . . .	21	
XIII. Saul, King, . . .	40	
XIV. From the death of Saul to the founding of the Temple by Solomon, . . .	43	
	478	6

The objections to this scheme are, 1st, That there seems to be a violation of the language of Scripture, in supposing that such expressions as "the land had rest forty years," mean only "the land had rest *in the fortieth year*." The Jesuit Ribera seems to have been the first who gave this interpretation; only that he dates from the death of Joshua and the elders, in the case of Othniel, while Usher dates from the rest under Joshua, (see Petav. de Doct. Temp., Tom. 2, p. 40, who rejects the opinion.) 2d, That it introduces a period of more than nine years between Gideon and Abimelech, for which there is no authority. 3d, That it brings the time of Jephthah too early by 36 years and 6 months, or to 263 years 6 months, instead of 300 years after the settlement of the two tribes and a half beyond Jordan, contrary to the express authority of Scripture. (See Judges xi. 26.)

The system of Sir John Marsham, published in 1672, takes for its basis the declaration of Jephthah, that from the settlement of the 2½ tribes beyond Jordan till his time, was a period of 300 years. As their settlement took place in the 40th year after the Exodus, he divides the whole period of time from the Exodus to the founding of Solomon's Temple into two intervals.

- | | |
|--|-----|
| I. From the Exodus to the time of Jephthah, | 340 |
| II. From the time of Jephthah to the fourth year of Solomon, | 140 |

480

He then argues that there never was a succession of judges in Israel; that after the death of Joshua, there was no human captain of the Lord's Host; that the republic was a theocracy; that the term Judges was used in the same sense as the Suffetes among the Carthaginians, who were of Phenician origin, (Heb. Shophetim), to denote sometimes persons to whom Israel applied for advice or to decide controversies, as Deborah and Samuel, after the election of Saul—sometimes persons of pontifical authority, as in the case of Heli—sometimes extraordinary deliverers raised up by God in some particular tribe, as was the case with Ehud, Gideon, Jephthah, and many others; and that such deliverers or avengers might or might not have authority to govern, there being no evidence that Samson, for example, ever governed the nation: that consequently many of these judges might be contemporary: and that it was the sense of weakness from this want of union which led the worldly-minded Israelites, forgetful that their protection depended on their faith in God's promises, to demand a king like other nations. He fortifies his argument by showing that the Philistines on the west were repulsed by Shamgar, while the Moabites on the east were overcome by Ehud; that Jabin, king of Canaan, who lived on the north, was opposed and subdued by the northern tribes under Barak; and that in the double incursion of the Ammonites on the east, and the Philistines on the west, the burthen of the Ammonitic rested on Jephthah and his people beyond Jordan, while the Philistine was opposed chiefly by Judah and the neighboring tribes. To see the full force of this argument, it will be necessary, in reading the book of Judges, to have a map of Judea as divided among the tribes before your eyes. His scheme then is as follows:—

The first interval of 340 years is divided thus; Moses 40+Joshua 25, (the time of his government according to Josephus), + 35, or rather less, for the time of the elders who outlived him, and the period of anarchy in which the disorders were committed mentioned in the latter part of the book of Judges.

Then followed the 1st servitude of the whole of Israel under the powerful king of Mesopotamia, Cushan Rischathaim, for 8 years, and rest under Othniel of the tribe of Judah 40 years. Then the second servitude under the Moabites for 18 years, and the rest effected by Ehud, and which lasted in the eastern part for 80 years. It is not to be supposed that Ehud lived so long, and he conjectures that he died about 20 years after he had delivered his countrymen from

the Moabitish yoke. Contemporary with him was Shamgar on the west, who delivered his tribe from the Philistines. After the death of Ehud, the east still remaining quiet, the west was invaded by Jabin, 185 years after the Exodus, and his tyranny continued for 20 years. At the end of this time Sisera and all the host of Jabin being defeated by the tribes of Zebulun and Nephthali, under Deborah and Barak, the western tribes had rest 40 years, the remainder of the period of 80 years quiet enjoyed by the eastern tribes. The whole of Israel now sinking into a general idolatry, were delivered to the Midianites, under whom they suffered a severe servitude for 7 years. God then raised up Gideon, and, the Midianites being destroyed, the tribes remained in quiet for forty years. From this time the period of Abimelech, Tola, and Jair, brings us down to the end of the first interval, a space of 48 years.

The general idolatry which then prevailed, extending to the gods of all the nations around Israel, brought them under a most grievous servitude, which began on the east to the Ammonites, and on the west to the Philistines. That on the east, after 18 years, was ended by the victory of Jephthah, while that on the west continued for 40 years. During the first half of this period occurred the exploits of Samson. The destruction he occasioned at his death reviving the hopes of the Israelites, they ventured to attack the Philistines under Hophni and Phinehas, but were defeated and the ark was taken. This occasioned the death of Eli, who had judged Israel for 40 years. Samuel now began to have authority in consequence of the favor shown him by God in the 2d year of Jephthah, and he continued to judge Israel, contemporary with Ibzan and Elon, for 20 years, during which time the ark remained in the house of Obed Edom. At the end of this second 20 years, the Israelites were delivered from the tyranny of the Philistines, by the victory of Ebenezer, under Samuel. This happened one year before the death of Elon. Abdon judged for 8 years, and Samuel for 16, after the battle of Ebenezer; but the disorders committed by Samuel's sons, who with himself then judged Israel, finally caused the nation to ask for a king. God permitted their request, though it arose from a want of faith, to be granted. Saul was then anointed, and according to Josephus Samuel lived after this period 18 years. The war with the Philistines broke out with renewed fury, 2 years after Saul was made king, and continued all his life-time, or 22 years after the death of Samuel, according to Josephus. This makes the whole period of Saul's reign 40 years, in which Josephus agrees with Acts xiii. After the death of Saul, David reigned 40 years, and in the 4th year of Solomon the temple was founded.

Such is Sir John Marsham's system; and as far as his argument is founded on the character of the judicial office, it strikes me that it is preferable to that of the chronologers, who make all the judges successive. But there is a difficulty to which the learned author does not seem to have adverted; and that is, that the period of 300 years from Moses to Jephthah must extend to the beginning of Jephthah's government, and consequently must include the 18 years

of servitude with which, as synchronizing with the commencement of the 40 years of Philistine bondage, he has begun his second interval. Under all these difficulties, which it is perhaps impossible to solve entirely, I will venture to add a computation, which, in default of a better, you may use in the formation of your chronological table. Probability, you will perceive, is all that any chronologer can aim at; and among the conflicting schemes, this seems to me to be as little liable to objection as any which can be offered.

I remain very faithfully, yours,

Exodus from Egypt,	2513
Entrance into the promised land under Joshua,	2553
Joshua dies at the age of 110, after ruling Israel 25 years,	2578
Allow for the elders who outlived Joshua, and for the period of anarchy in the time of Phinehas, the son of Eleazar the High Priest (Judges xx.), when the disorders of Micah, the Levite, the destruction of the tribe of Benjamin, and other enormities were committed, 16 years, till	2594
I. Servitude under Cushan for 8 years, till	2602
Rest under Othniel for 40 years, ends	2642
II. Servitude under Eglon, king of Moab, 18 years, ends	2660
Rest of the eastern tribes under Ehud commences. Philistines repulsed on the West by Shamgar, during the life of Ehud, suppose 5 years after the freedom under Ehud,	2665
Ehud dies, as we suppose, about 20 years after he had given rest,	2680
III. And the same year (Jud. iv. 1.) Northern and Western Israelites sold by God to Jabin, who oppresses them 20 years, to the year	2700
Sisera then defeated, and the rest under Deborah and Barak commences and continues 40 years, ending at the same time with the 80 years rest of the Eastern tribes by the irruption of the	
IV. Midianites, and the fourth servitude which begins in	2740
This severe servitude ended by Gideon, in	2747
Eli born in the tenth year of Gideon,	2757
Gideon dies after giving rest for 40 years, in	2787
Abimelech reigns 3 years and is killed,	2790
Tola judges Israel 23 years and dies,	2813
Eli begins to judge Israel at the age of 58, and in the 2d year of Jair,	2815
Jair dies after having judged Israel 22 years,	2835
V. The year of Jair's death, the 20th of Eli, begins the double servitude under the Philistines in the West, and the Ammonites in the East, which latter lasts for 18 years, when the tribes beyond Jordan are delivered by Jephthah 300 years after they first settled the land. In the mean time the exploits of Samson against the	

Philistines take place, and continue for 20 years, being terminated by his death in	2855
The Israelites, encouraged by the destruction of so many of the Philistines at Samson's death, hazard a battle under Hophni and Phinehas, are defeated, and the ark is taken. The news occasions the death of Eli, in the 98th year of his age. At this time we will suppose that Samuel was 15 years old. The favor of God towards him gave him the authority of a judge among the people.	
Jephthah dies, having been judge for 6 years,	2859
Ibzan dies, having judged 7 years,	2866
When Samuel had judged Israel 20 years, occurred the battle of Ebenezer, which put an end to the 40 years servitude to the Philistines,	2875
Elon dies, having judged Israel 10 years,	2876
Abdon dies at the end of 8 years,	2884
34 years after the battle of Ebenezer, when Samuel, according to our computation, was 69 years old, and his sons had committed disorders, Saul is anointed king over Israel, in	2909
War with Philistines recommences in the 2d year of Saul	2911
Samuel dies according to Josephus in the 18th year of Saul's reign,	2927
Saul, 22 years after Samuel's death, defeated and slain,	2949
David succeeds him, and reigns 40 years, dies,	2989
Solomon begins to build the Temple in the 4th year of his reign and 480th year after the Exodus,	2993

II.—THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE KINGS OF JUDAH AND ISRAEL.

This period is still more difficult than the preceding. It is, if we may so speak, the dividing line, the meeting of the waters of chronology. Hitherto the tide of time has flowed onward from the Creation; when the length of this period is defined, it must flow back from the common Christian era.

We have not here the advantage of an extreme limit assigned by the express declaration of Holy Scripture, like that contained in 1 Kings vi. 1. We must gather the length of the period from comparing the length of the several reigns of which it is composed. This may at first appear extremely easy; but any one who attempts it will find himself beset with difficulties. The different conclusions at which Petavius, Usher, Marsham, and Hales have arrived, effectually exhibit what these difficulties must be. The whole chronological period, from

the fifth year of Solomon to the destruction of the Temple, according to the computation of Petavius, is 423 years and 6 months. Archbishop Usher differs not greatly from Petavius: "The Temple," he says, "was destroyed towards the close of the year of Nebuchadnezzar 19 (Jerem. lii. 12; 2 Kings xxv. 8.), at the beginning of the first year of the 48th Olympiad, in the current year of Nabonassar 160; and after it was founded by Solomon, 424 years, 3 months, and 8 days. In the same fifth month, (Jerem. i. 3), all the walls of Jerusalem being broken down, those who were left in the city, those who had gone over to the king of Babylon, and the residue of the common people, together with the treasures of the king and the princes, and the utensils of the house of God, were carried away by Nebuzaradan to Babylon. (Jerem. xxxix. 8, 9—lii. 14-23; 2 Kings xxv. 10-17; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 18, 19, 20). Thus was Judah carried away captive out of his own land (Jerem. lii. 27; 2 Kings xxv. 21) 463 years from the beginning of the reign of David, 388 years from the separation of the ten tribes, and 134 years after the destruction of the kingdom of Israel."—Usher's *Annal. v. Age of the World*. Sir John Marsham, on the other hand, says: "The Temple of Jerusalem, from its foundation by Solomon, stood, according to our computation, 400 years. Of this time, there are two intervals; the first ending with the destruction of the kingdom of Israel; the second ending with that of the kingdom of Judah and the Temple. The first contains 272 years; the last 128 years, 5 months, and 7 days."—*Chron. Can., sec. xv. p. 383, comp. with sec. xvii p. 497*.

Dr. Hales, in his *Analysis of Sacred Chronology*, makes the whole duration of the kingdom of Israel, from the first of Jeroboam to the ninth of Hoshea, 271 years; and the whole duration of the kingdom of Judah, from the first of Rehoboam to the eleventh of Zedekiah, 404 years. The former he effects, first, by shortening the reigns of Baasha, Elab, and Omri, three of the first eight kings of Israel, each one year, to make them synchronize completely with the first six kings of Judah; and secondly, by inserting two interregnums amounting to 32 years,

the first of 22 years between Jeroboam II. and Zechariah and Shallum, the second of ten years between Pekah and Hoshea. The latter he effects, first, by considering all the years of the kings of Judah as complete years, contrary to the computations of the other chronologers; and, secondly, by inserting between Amaziah and Uzziah an interregnum of eleven years.

By adding to these numbers 37 years of Solomon, from the fourth year of his reign, inclusive, we have Dr. Hales' computation of the whole period, as follows:

From the foundation to the destruction of the Temple $(37+404)=441$ years. This is divided into two sub-periods, viz.:

1. From the foundation of the Temple to the destruction of the kingdom of Israel, $(37+271) \quad - \quad - \quad - = 308$
2. From that time to the destruction of the kingdom of Judah and the Temple $(441-308) \quad - \quad - \quad - = 133$

—
441 years.

This last sub-period differs only one year from the computation of Archbishop Usher, and between four and five years from that of Sir John Marsham. It is evident, therefore, that the principal difficulties lie within the first sub-period; and as there is no question with respect to the years of Solomon, they are, in fact, confined to the collateral reigns of the kings of Israel and Judah. In the computation of these alone, Dr. Hales exceeds Archbishop Usher $(271-254)=17$ years; and he differs from Sir John Marsham $(308-272)=36$ years. This latter difference is nearly accounted for by the 32 years of interregnum in the kingdom of Israel, and the 11 years of interregnum in the kingdom of Judah, according to Dr. Hales' system. With regard to the number and extent of the several reigns, there is not, and cannot be, any material difference, as the following comparative tables of the kingdoms of Judah and Israel will fully show.

TABLE OF THE KINGS OF JUDAH.

According to I. & II. Kings.	According to Chronicles.	Y. M. D.	Josephus. V. M. D.	Y.	Eusebius. M.	Ch. men=Alex. Y. M. D.	Petavius and Usher. Y. M. D.	Dr. Paley. Y. M. D.
1 Solomon		40	80	40		40	40	40
2 Rehoboam		17	17	16		17	17	17
3 Abijah	Abijah	3	3	3		3	3	3
4 Asa		41	41	41		23	41	41
5 Jehoshaphat		25	25	25		5	25	25
6 Jehoram		8	8	8		8	8	8
7 Ahaziah		1	1	1		1	1	1
8 Athaliah		6	6	7		8	6	6
9 Jehoash	Joash	40	40	40		40	40	40
10 Amaziah		29	29	28		39	29	29
11 Azariah	Uzziah	52	52	52		52	52	11 Interreg.
12 Jotham		16	16	16		16	16	52
13 Ahaz		16	16	16		16	16	16
14 Hezekiah		29	29	29		29	29	29
15 Manasseh		55	55	55		55	55	55
16 Amon		2	2	2 (In 2nd p. 12.)		2	2	2
17 Josiah		31	31	31	3	31	31	31
18 Jehoahaz		3	3	3	10	3	3	3
19 Jehoiakim		11	11	11		11	11	11
20 Jehoiachin		3	3	3		3	3	3
21 Zedekiah		11	11	14 (Can. 11.)		11	11	11
Deduct the years of Solomon previous to the foundation of the Temple, and there remain for this period according to the succession of Kings.		433	610 473	610 435	6	435	610 433	444
		3	3	3		3	4	3
		430	610 470	610 432	6	432	610 429	441
							6 from 5th year of Sol.	6
								10

TABLE OF THE KINGS OF ISRAEL.

Names of Kings of Israel.	I & II. Kings.	Josephus.	Eusebius Can. Chron. Lib. II.	Petravius.	Dr. Hales Script. Comp.
Jeroboam	22	22	22	22	22
Nadab	2	2	2	2	2
Baasha	24	24	24	24	23
Eiah	2	2	2	2	1
Zimri and Omri	120 m. 7 d.	120 m. 7 d.	120 m. 7 d.	120 m. 7 d.	12
Ahab	22	22	22	22	22
Alaziah	2	2	2	2	2
Jehoram	12	12	12	12	12
Jehu	28	27	28	28	28
Jehoahaz	17	17	17	17	17
Jehoash, or Joash	16	16	16	16	16
Jeroboam II.	41	40	41	41	41
Zechariah	6 m.	6 m.	6 m.	6 m.	41
Shallum	1 m.	1 m.	1 m.	1 m.	22 1st Inter.
Menahem	10	10	10	10	1
Pekahiah	2	2	10	2	10
Pekah	20	20	20	20	2
Hoshea	9	9	9	9	20
	241 7 m.	239 7 m.	249 7 m.	241 7 m.	9
					271

No remarks are necessary on these tables; because the reader will see at once that all the departures from the Hebrew Scriptures in Josephus, Clemens Alexandrinus, and Eusebius, are errors. It seems difficult to account for the prolongation of the reign of Solomon by

Josephus (*Ant. Jud.*, Lib. viii. cap. 7, § 8,) from 40 to 80 years. Reduce this reign to the Scripture measure, and all the difference ceases. Yet that he must have reckoned the reign of Solomon as 80 years appears from the tenth book of his *Antiquities*, where he speaks of the destruction of the Temple by Nebuchadnezzar. He there says that "the city was taken in the eleventh year of the reign of Zedekiah, on the ninth day of the fourth month, about midnight." And a little further on (§ 4) he says: "Thus did they who were reigning, of the race of David, terminate their existence, being in number 21 to the last king. All the years that they reigned were five hundred and fourteen, and six months, and ten days; twenty of which years, the first of them, King Saul held the government, not being of the same tribe (§ 5). The Babylonian sent his general, Nabuzardan, to Jerusalem to spoil the Temple, ordering him also to burn it and the royal palace, to level the city, and transport the inhabitants to Babylon. Being come to Jerusalem in the eleventh year of the reign of Zedekiah, he rifled the Temple, and carried away all the gold and silver vessels of God, and the great laver which Solomon had dedicated; also, the brazen columns with their chapiters, and the golden tables and candelabra. Carrying away all these, he set fire to the Temple on the new moon of the fifth month, in the eleventh year of the reign of Zedekiah, the eighteenth (19?) of Nebuchadnezzar, and burned the royal palace and destroyed the city. Now the Temple was burned 470 years, 6 months, and 10 days after it was built. From the departure of the people from Egypt, it was then 1062 years, 6 months, and 10 days. The whole period of time from the Deluge to the destruction of the Temple, was 1957 years, 6 months, and 10 days. From the creation of Adam to these events which befell the Temple, were 3513 years, 6 months, and ten days."—*Ant. Jud.*, Lib. x. c. 8. §§ 2, 4, 5.

It must here be remarked concerning the first statement of Josephus in the above cited passage, that the kings of Judah, from Solomon to Zedekiah, were in number twenty. Athaliah is of course excluded, as

having usurped the sovereignty. Her son Jehoash, whom she attempted to murder, was but one year old when his father was slain by Jehu; and she reigned during the first six years of his minority, until he was seven years old. Consequently, from David, inclusive, and not from Saul, inclusive, the number of the kings of Judah was twenty-one. But if we reduce the number of years in each reign to the Scripture measure, the sum will be found to accord nearly with the whole number, 514, here given by Josephus, and thus he himself is made to correct the errors of his text, as it now stands, with regard to the reigns of Saul and Solomon.

No. of Kings	Names of the Kings of Judah	Length of the several reigns according to Josephus.			Corrected.	
	Saul	Ant. Jud. Lib. vi., c. 14, s. 9	20		40	
1	David	" vii., c. 15, s. 2	40	6	40	6
2	Solomon	" viii., c. 7, s. 8	80		40	
3	Rehoboam	" viii., c. 10, s. 4	17		17	
4	Abijam or } Abijah }	" viii., c. 11, s. 3	3		3	
5	Asa	" viii., c. 12, s. 6	41		41	
6	Jehoshaphat	" ix., c. 3, s. 2	25		25	
7	Jehoram	" ix., c. 5, s. 3	8		8	
8	Ahaziah	" ix., c. 6, s. 3	1		1	
	Athaliah	" ix., c. 7, s. 1	6		6	
9	Jehoash or } Joash }	" ix., c. 8, s. 4	40		40	
10	Amaziah	" ix., c. 9, s. 3	29		29	
11	Azariah or } Uzziah }	" ix., c. 10, s. 4	52		52	
12	Jotham	" ix., c. 12, s. 1	16		16	
13	Ahaz	" ix., c. 12, s. 3	16		16	
14	Hezekiah	" x., c. 3, s. 1	29		25	
15	Manasseh	" x., c. 3, s. 2	55		55	
16	Amon	" x., c. 4, s. 1	2		2	
17	Josiah	" x., c. 5, s. 1	31		31	
18	Jehoahaz	" x., c. 5, s. 2		3		3
19	Jehoiakim	" x., c. 6, s. 3	11		11	
20	Jehoiachin	" x., c. 6, s. 3		3 10		3 10
21	Zedekiah	" x., c. 8, s. 2	11		11	
			534		10 514	10

We come now to the other statements. "The Temple was burned 470 years, 6 months, and 10 days after it was built." It has been seen by the comparative table, that

this number is produced by counting the reign of Solomon as 80 years. Reduce his reign to the Scripture measure, by taking 40 from 470, and the difference between his computation and that of the Scriptures is at an end. "From the departure of the people from Egypt it was then 1062 years, 6 months, and 10 days." Josephus stated as we have seen (Ant. Jud., Lib. viii. c. 3), that Solomon began to build the Temple 592 years after the Exodus. The two calculations perfectly harmonize; and both are to be corrected.

	Josephus.			Scriptures.		
From the Exodus to the foundation of the Temple	592			480		
From the foundation to the destruction of the Temple	470	6	10	430	6	10
Difference of computations by the reigns of Kings,	1062	6	10	910	6	10

But the remaining computations in the two passages from the eighth and tenth books of the Antiquities, here quoted, do not harmonize.

	Years.	Mths.	Days.
It is stated (Lib. x. c. 8, s. 5), that from the Deluge to the destruction of the Temple, the whole period of time was	1957	6	10
From this sum deduct the time from the foundation of the Temple to its destruction, as here stated	470	6	10
And it leaves as the period from the Deluge to the foundation	1487		
But according to Lib. viii. c. 3, the same period was	1440		
Exhibiting an excess over the former computation of	47		
So from the Creation to the destruction of the Temple	3513	6	10
Deduct from the foundation of the Temple	470	6	10
And it makes from the Creation to the foundation of the Temple	3043		
Whereas, in Lib. viii. c. 3, the same period was stated to be	3102		
Exhibiting a diminution from the former computation of	59		

These discrepancies are so obvious, that any further remarks would be superfluous. I pass on, therefore, to the account which Josephus gives of the extinction of the kingdom of Israel (*Ant. Jud.*, Lib. ix. c. 14, s. 1). "Salmanasares, king of the Assyrians, being informed that the king of the Israelites had sent secretly to Soas, king of the Egyptians, inviting him to confederate with him against him (Salmanasares), and being greatly provoked at this, marched against Samaria, in the seventh year of the reign of Hoshea. The king not receiving him, he besieged the city three years, and took it by force, in the ninth year of Hoshea's reign, and the seventh [6th ?] of Hezekiah, king of Jerusalem. Thus he extinguished the government of the Israelites, and carried the whole people captive into Media and Persia, among whom he took the king, Hoshea, alive. Having then transferred other nations from the latter country, from a place called Chuth (for there is a river in Persia bearing that name), he caused them to inhabit Samaria and the country of the Israelites. The ten tribes of the Israelites were therefore carried captive from Judæa 947 years after their ancestors had come out of Egypt and possessed that country, 800 years after the government of Joshua. From the time when they revolted from Rehoboam, the grandson of David, and gave the kingdom to Jeroboam, as I have previously stated, 240 years, 7 months, and 7 days."

By the comparative table of the kings of Israel, in which the testimony of Josephus is given in detail, from *Lib. viii. c. 11, s. 4*, to *Lib. ix. c. 14*, it will be seen that their united reigns are,

	Years.	Months.	Days.
According to the Scriptures,	241	7	7
According to Josephus,	239	7	7

This difference of two years is caused by his calling the reign of Jehu (*Ant. Jud.*, Lib. ix. c. 8, s. 1), 27 years, and that of Jeroboam II. (*Lib. ix. c. 10, s. 3*), 40 years. In the present passage he makes the whole amount of their reigns 240y. 7m. 7d., thus correcting his former dates in one of these places, and coming within one year of the Scripture chronology.

But with regard to the other computations of time in this passage, they will not bear the touch-stone of critical examination. We have seen that Josephus makes the time from the Exodus to the destruction of the Temple, 1062y. 6m. 10d. Here he makes the time from the Exodus to the extinction of the ten tribes, 947 years. The difference between these sums, 115y. 6m. 10d., is the time which elapsed from the extinction of the ten tribes to the Destruction of the Temple; whereas by the reigns of the kings of Judah from the 7th of Hezekiah to the 11th of Zedekiah inclusive, as given by Josephus, the same interval amounts to 133y. 6m. 10d.

Again: After the Exodus Joshua lived with Moses 40 years, and commanded after his death 25 years. (*Ant. Jud.*, Lib. v. c. 1, § 29). If then the extinction of the ten tribes took place 947 years after the Exodus, ($947 - 65 = 882$), it must have taken place 882, and not 800 years, after the government of Joshua. But enough has been said to show that no dependence is to be placed on the dates of early events in Josephus, whenever he deviates from those of the Holy Scriptures; whether that deviation be the result of his own inaccuracy, or of errors which have crept into his text. Casting aside, therefore, all other authorities, we will proceed to the difficult task of synchronizing the collateral reigns of the kings of Judah and Israel, according to the testimony of the first and second books of Kings.

It is observable that these reigns may be divided into two periods. The first begins with the reigns of Rehoboam and Jeroboam, which are considered as beginning together, though the circumstances of the narrative show that some little time intervened between the death of Solomon and the revolt of the ten tribes. There may be some truth in the Rabbinical rule quoted from the Talmud by Petavius (*de Doct. Temp.*, Lib. ix. c. 60), that the reigns of the Jewish monarchs were computed from the spring month Nisan, the beginning of their ecclesiastical year, while those of foreign kings were computed from the autumnal month Tisri, the beginning of their civil year. If this rule meant, as is most pro-

bable, to consider the kings of Israel as foreigners, because they had lapsed into idolatry, it at once makes a difference of six months in the computation of the several reigns, and will help us greatly in the difficulties which we are now to consider. This period begins with Rehoboam and Jeroboam, and ends with Ahaziah and Jehoram, both of whom were killed on the same day by Jehu, (2 Kings, c. ix. 24, 27). The number of the kings of Judah from Rehoboam to Ahaziah is six; that of the kings of Israel from Jeroboam to Jehoram, eight. Yet the number of years in each series being summed up, it will be found that the united reigns of the six kings of Judah amount to 95 years, and the united reigns of the eight kings of Israel to 98 years and 7 days. This excess of three years must be removed thus, as Dr. Hales has concisely stated it: "*Baasha* began to reign in the third year of *Asa*, king of Judah, 1 Kings, xv. 33; and his son *Ela*, in the twenty-sixth year of *Asa*, xvi. 8, which gives the reign of *Baasha*, $26-3=23$ years complete. *Ela* was slain in the twenty-seventh of *Asa*, xvi. 10; he reigned, therefore, only $27-26=1$ year complete. And *Zimri* and *Omri* reigned in succession, from the twenty-seventh to the thirty-eighth of *Asa*, xvi. 29; or only $38-27=11$ years complete. And as their reigns were all included in the one reign of *Asa*, and therefore more likely to be correctly referred thereto, this is a reason why these three reigns should be selected for reduction, rather than the succeeding or the preceding."—Hales' Analysis, vol. ii., p. 373-4.

The second period begins with the usurpation of Athaliah, and ends with the sixth year inclusive of Hezekiah, amounting in the whole to 165 years; whereas the ten reigns in Israel from Jehu to the ninth year inclusive of Hoshea, which we know from 2 Kings xviii. 10, coincided with the sixth of Hezekiah, amounts only to 143 years and 7 months. Here is a difference of 21 years and 5 months; so that there must have been one or more interregnums in the kingdom of Judah, at least to that amount, although the Bible, Josephus, and Eusebius are entirely silent on the subject. I say that *there must have been*, if we take the succession of the

kings of Judah as the standard, and admit of no interregnum or regency in the latter kingdom.

But on this very point concerning the kingdom of Judah, there is a great difficulty. It appears from 2 Kings, xiv. 1, 2, that Amaziah, king of Judah, began to reign in the second year of Joash king of Israel, and reigned 29 years; and from the 17th verse of the same chapter that he lived after the death of the same Joash 15 years. If the second year of Joash began in the autumnal month Tisri, and the first year of Amaziah in the spring month Nisan; if Joash or Jehoash died, as we must infer from 2 Kings, xiv. 23, in the 15th year of Amaziah, having reigned 16 years (xiii. 10); then there were fourteen complete years of Amaziah preceding his death, and 15 years after it; so that Jeroboam II. began to reign over Israel in the fifteenth year of Amaziah, as is expressly said, 2 Kings, xiv. 23. Consequently Amaziah died in the fifteenth year of Jeroboam II. But his successor Azariah or Uzziah began to reign in the twenty-seventh year of Jeroboam II. (2 Kings, xv. 1); and if it was at the beginning of the twenty-seventh year, as the death of Amaziah may have been at the end of the fifteenth, then the difference between 26 complete years, and 15 complete years of Jeroboam, i. e. 11 complete years, must have been a period of interregnum or regency in Judah. But the Scriptures are entirely silent as to any such interregnum or regency; and silent too in a very remarkable manner. For after speaking of the conspiracy against Amaziah, in consequence of which he was slain, the sacred historian immediately adds, (xiv. 21), "And all the people of Judah took Azariah, which was sixteen years old, and made him king instead of his father Amaziah." The same testimony is given 2 Chron. xxvi. 1, with this difference only that Azariah is there called Uzziah. He was taken by *all* the people. There was no popular commotion; no division of opinion. His right to the throne was undisputed. Yet in 2 Kings, xv. 1, 2, it is said: "In the twenty and seventh year of Jeroboam, king of Israel, began Azariah son of Amaziah, king of Judah, to reign. Sixteen years old was he when he began to

reign, and he reigned two and fifty years in Jerusalem." The question then is, Was Azariah 16 years old when his father died at the end of the fifteenth year of Jeroboam II., or eleven years after at the beginning of the twenty-seventh year of Jeroboam II.? Here the opinions of the learned are at variance. Some suppose that Azariah was taken by the people when his father was killed; that he was then 16 years old; and that the 52 years of his reign are to be counted as commencing with the sixteenth year of Jeroboam II. Others think that he was 16 years old when he began to reign at the commencement of the twenty-seventh year of the king of Israel. The former admit of no interregnum in Judah; while the latter admit that there was an interregnum of eleven years. The first scheme is that of Petavius and Archbishop Usher; the last, that of Dr. Hales. Both agree in making the reigns of the kings of Judah their standard, and are consequently obliged to allow of one or more interregnums in the more turbulent kingdom of Israel. Sir John Marsham, on the contrary, admits no interregnum in Israel, and is disposed to contract the reigns of the kings of Judah, by making some of their years collateral, so as to bring them within the sum of the reigns of the kings of Israel as mentioned in the Bible. This, if I mistake not, will be made apparent by the following synopsis. (See next page.)

Sir John Marsham.		Petavius and Archbishop Usher.		Dr. Hales.	
Years of Solomon after his fourth, United reigns of the kings of Is- rael, shortened by collateral reigns from 241 years, 7m. 7d., so as to make in round num- bers,	36	Years of Solomon after his fourth, United reigns of the kings of Ju- dah, shortened by collateral reigns from 393 years, 6m. 10d., so as to make in round numbers,	36	Years of Solomon after his fourth, First Period from the defection of the ten tribes to the extinction of their kingdom in the 6th year of Hezekiah, in- cluding 2 inter- regnums in Is- rael, and 1 in Judah, . . .	36
United reigns of the kings of Ju- dah after the sixth year of Hezekiah short- ened from 133y. 6m. 10. to	236		388	Second Period, embracing the reigns of the kings of Judah, from the 7th of Hezekiah to the 11th of Zedeki- ah, 133y. 6m. 10d., or in round numbers,	271
	128				133
Whole duration of the first Temple,	400	Whole duration of the first Temple,	424	Whole duration of the first Temple,	440

Dr. Hales says 441; but this is occasioned by his computing after the third, and not after the fourth year of Solomon. Though in other parts of his work he inclines to conjectural criticism, and does not always show that reverence for the Hebrew Scriptures to which, in the judgment of the present writer, they are entitled, yet in the present scheme he takes the Hebrew text as it is, and shortens the reigns of the kings only where, as in the case of the first eight kings of Israel, it is rendered necessary by the sacred history itself.

In this conformity to the Hebrew Text, I am inclined to agree with Dr. Hales, for the following reasons:

1. When the three eminent critics, Petavius, Usher, and Marsham, wrote, the criticism of the sacred text was in its infancy. They could not proceed upon the sure basis of the collation of manuscripts which

shows the great integrity of the Hebrew text; and, therefore, they were more willing to be guided by conjecture than we ought to be, now that this integrity is so well established.

2. All but Sir John Marsham have admitted the existence of one or more interregnums in the kingdom of Israel, though the Scriptures and Josephus are silent on the subject. By parity of reason, therefore, we may admit the space of eleven years between the death of Amaziah, and the actual reign of Azariah or Uzziah. The only difficulty is in the words, "which was sixteen years old," in 2 Kings, xiv. 21, immediately after the death of Amaziah is mentioned; but as the very same words occur in chap. xv. 2, it is possible that they may have crept into the former passage, from a marginal reference to the latter. Be this as it may, the testimony is so clear in 2 Kings, xv. 1, 2, that Azariah was sixteen years old in the twenty-seventh year of Jeroboam II. when his actual reign commenced, that we cannot, as it seems to me, admit of his being more than five years old when his father died, and consequently there must have been a minority of eleven years. I do not call it an interregnum as Dr. Hales calls it, in which Mr. Miller has followed him, probably without knowing it. For I see no evidence that the title of Azariah or Uzziah to the crown, was disputed, but precisely the contrary. He was five years old when his father was killed. It is to be presumed, therefore, from the manner in which the Scriptures speak, that he was taken by all the people at that tender age to be their king, but that the affairs of the kingdom were conducted by a regency. According to the system of the Theocracy, the High Priest, with the great council, were the proper persons to direct the affairs of the nation until the king was old enough himself to govern. This he was thought to be in the twenty-seventh year of Jeroboam II. when he himself was sixteen years old.

3. The manner in which the Scriptures speak of the incapacity of Azariah or Uzziah to reign after he became a leper strengthens these conclusions. He was punished with leprosy for violating the priest's office,

and remained a leper to the day of his death. (2 Kings, xv. 5, 2 Chron. xxvi. 16—23.) Being driven by the priests from the Temple, and in fact excommunicated as an unclean person, “he dwelt in a several house, being a leper; for he was cut off from the house of the Lord; and Jotham his son was over the king’s house, judging the people of the land.”—“So Uzziah slept with his fathers, and they buried him with his fathers. And Jotham his son reigned in his stead.” At the time of his death his son Jotham was 25 years of age. (2 Chron. xxvii. 1.) We do not know how long Uzziah was a leper; but it is probable that Jotham was old enough to administer in affairs of state, and therefore “he was over the king’s house, judging the people of the land.” His actual reign was counted, not from the time of Uzziah’s incapacity, but from the time of his death. Jotham, therefore, was regent for some years before he became king; but as to the period of his life, at that time, or when Uzziah was smitten with leprosy, both the Scriptures and Josephus are as silent, as they are with regard to the eleven years of Uzziah’s minority.

Considering the period of time from the foundation to the destruction of the Temple as being 441 years, the computation of time, according to the Hebrew text will be as follows:

	Y.	M.	D
From the Creation to the end of the Deluge, -	1656		
From the Deluge to the birth of Abraham, -	352		
From the birth of Abraham to the Exodus, -	505		
From the Exodus to the fourth year of Solomon inclusive, - - - - -	480		
From the fifth year of Solomon to his death inclusive, - - - - -	36		
From the reign of Rehoboam and the defection of the ten tribes, to the death of Ahaziah and Jehoram, both killed the same day by Jehu, -	95		
From the usurpation of Athaliah and the reign of Jehu, to the sixth of Hezekiah and ninth of Hoshea inclusive, when the kingdom of Israel was destroyed, - - - - -	176		
From the seventh year of Hezekiah to the eleventh of Zedekiah, the end of the 18th and beginning of the nineteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar, when the Temple was destroyed, -	133	6	10
	3433	6	10

Therefore the year of the world at the destruction of Solomon's Temple was the 3434th.

III.—THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE ASSYRIAN EMPIRE AND THE KINGDOM OF BABYLON.

The chronology of the kingdom of Babylon must be treated of first, because we have the means of ascertaining it with the greatest precision. We can then arrange with greater ease the more uncertain chronology of the Assyrian Empire. During this period, the union is formed between the several chronologies of sacred and profane history: and the doubts and difficulties which impeded their union, are cleared up by the accurate observations of astronomy and the precise calculations of mathematical science.

THE CANON OF PTOLEMY.

On the capture of Babylon by Alexander the Great, there fell into the hands of the Greeks a series of records of astronomical observations, which Callisthenes transmitted from Babylon to Greece, at the instance of his master Aristotle. These observations, the oldest then in existence, Hipparchus, an eminent astronomer under Ptolemy Philadelphus, adjusted to the Egyptian method of calculation, "from the original records," as he himself states, "which had been kept at Babylon and brought from thence." The work of Hipparchus is lost; but this loss has been partially supplied by Alexander Claudius Ptolemæus the famous Egyptian astronomer who flourished in the reign of the Roman Emperor Antoninus Pius.* His chronological canon has enabled modern chronologers to fix with precision the dates of the several reigns he has mentioned from the first year of Nabonassar to the death of Alexander the Great.

"All the observations of Ptolemy," says Petavius, "a great many of which are noted by him according to the years and months of the era of Nabonassar, prove most

* A good edition of the works of Ptolemy is still a desideratum. It would necessarily be expensive; but it deserves the munificent patronage of the University of Oxford.

certainly that the epoch so called began in the year of the Julian Period 3967, Solar Cycle xix, Lunar Cycle xv, on Wednesday the 26th of February. The years of Nabonassar are simple Egyptian years of 365 days. Whence it proceeds that after four years the first day of Thoth recedes a day; and after 1460 years having passed through the whole of a Julian year it returns to the same day from which it sets out.

We can therefore demonstrate that the Epoch of Nabonassar coincides with the year of which we have spoken, by all the celestial observations described by Ptolemy. For example: In his fourth book he states three computations of lunar eclipses sent from Babylon by Callisthenes. The first happened when Phanocrates was Archon of Athens in the year of Nabonassar 366, Thoth 27, 6h. 30' after midnight at Alexandria. This agrees with Lunar Cycle 18, Solar Cycle 19, Letter E. Ann. Jul. Per. 4331, December 23, Tuesday, at the close of the year 383, before the beginning of the Dionysian [or common Christian] era. 365 complete Egyptian years with 26 days 6 hours and 30 minutes, in Thoth [the first month of the next year] make together 133,251 days 6h. 30' or 364 Julian years 300 days 6h. 30'. Therefore from,

An. Jul. Per.	4330	356d.	6h.	30m.
Subtract	364	300d.	6h.	30m.
Years	3966	56d.	0h.	0m.

and there remain 3966 complete years and 56 days, or counting from midnight 57 days, because Ptolemy, following the popular custom, reckoned from sunrise of the 57th day. The era of Nabonassar began, therefore, reckoning from the first of January, on the 27th of Feb. A. J. P. 3967. This eclipse we find from our tables took place 7h. 54' after midnight, Digits eclipsed $2\frac{1}{2}$, duration 1h. 42'. Beginning 6h. 56', ending 8h. 51'. Ptolemy therefore says rightly that the moon set eclipsed. The sun was then in $27^{\circ} 17'$ of Sagittarius,—Petav. de Doct. Temp., T. 2, p. 69. I omit the other calculations, as being merely cumulative evidence of

the same point; my present object being merely to make the reader aware of the unerring accuracy of this mode of computation. As the first year of the common Christian era coincides with the year 4714 of the Julian period, by subtracting 3967, we arrive at the year B. c. 747 as the first of the era of Nabonassar.

In the title of Ptolemy's canon he mentions two series of kings; the first of the Assyrian and Median kings to the beginning of Cyrus a period of 209 years; the second of the Persian kings to the death of Alexander the Great, a period of 215 years. From the reign of Nabonassar, therefore, to the death of Alexander the whole number of Egyptian years was 424. It is carefully to be observed, however, that Ptolemy reckons every reign from the first day of the first Egyptian month Thoth; not because the first king in the series or any other began to reign on that day, but because that day was the beginning of the Egyptian year. We shall have occasion in settling the chronology of the kings to revert to this fact.

With these few observations explanatory of Ptolemy's Canon, we proceed, first, to synchronize the [424] Egyptian years of the era of Nabonassar with the modern computations of time, to the beginning of the Christian *Æra*; and secondly, to give the series of kings with the dates thus established.

Æra Nab.	Jul. Per. *	B. C.	Æra Nab.	Jul. Per.	B. C.	Æra Nab.	Jul. Per.	B. C.
1	3967	747	16	3982	732	46	4012	702
Thoth.	19 15		Thoth.	6 11		47	4013	701
Feb. 26	E		Feb. 24	G		48	4014	700
2	3968	746	17	3983	731	Feb. 14		
	20 16			7 12		49	4015	699
	D			D		50	4016	698
3	3969	745	18	3984	730	51	4017	697
	21 17			8 13		52	4018	696
	C B			E		Feb. 13		
4	3970	744	19	3985	729	53	4019	695
Feb. 25	22 18			9 14		54	4020	694
	A			D C		55	4021	693
5	3971	743	20	3986	728	56	4022	692
	23 19		Thoth.			Feb. 12		
	G		Feb. 21			57	4023	691
6	3972	742	21	3987	727	58	4024	690
	24 1		22	3988	726	59	4025	689
	F		23	3989	725	60	4026	688
7	3973	741	24	3990	724	Feb. 11		
	25 2		Thoth.			61	4027	687
	E D		Feb. 20			62	4028	686
8	3974	740	25	3991	723	63	4029	685
Feb. 24	26 3		26	3992	722	64	4030	684
	C		27	3993	721	Feb. 20		
9	3975	739	28	3994	720	65	4031	683
	27 4		Feb. 19			66	4032	682
	B		29	3995	719	67	4033	681
10	3976	738	30	3996	718	68	4034	680
	28 5		31	3997	717	Feb. 9		
	A		32	3998	716	69	4035	679
11	3977	737	Feb. 18			70	4036	678
Thoth.	1 6		33	3999	715	71	4037	677
vi. Cal.	G F		34	4000	714	72	4038	676
prior			35	4001	713	Feb. 8		
Martii			36	4002	712	73	4039	675
12	3978	736	Feb. 17			74	4040	674
Feb. 23	2 7		37	4003	711	75	4041	673
	E		38	4004	710	76	4042	672
13	3979	735	39	4005	709	Feb. 7		
	3 8		40	4006	708	77	4043	671
	D		Feb. 16			78	4044	670
14	3980	734	41	4007	707	79	4045	669
	4 9		42	4008	706	80	4046	668
	C		43	4009	705	Feb. 6		
15	3981	733	44	4010	704	81	4047	667
	5 10		Feb. 15			82	4048	666
	B A		45	4011	703	83	4049	665

Æra Nab.	Jul. Per.	B. C.	Æra Nab.	Jul. Per.	B. C.	Æra Nab.	Jul. Per.	B. C.
84	4050	664	121	4087	627	159	4125	589
Feb. 5			122	4088	626	160	4126	588
85	4051	663	123	4089	625	Jan. 17		
86	4052	662	124	4090	624	161	4127	587
87	4053	661	Jan. 26			162	4128	586
88	4054	660	125	4091	623	163	4129	585
Feb. 4			126	4092	622	164	4130	584
89	4055	659	127	4093	621	Jan. 16		
90	4056	658	128	4094	620	165	4131	583
91	4057	657	Jan. 25			166	4132	582
92	4058	656	129	4095	619	167	4133	581
Feb. 3			130	4096	618	168	4134	580
93	4059	655	131	4097	617	Jan. 15		
94	4060	654	132	4098	616	169	4135	579
95	4061	653	Jan. 24			170	4136	578
96	4062	652	133	4099	615	171	4137	577
Feb. 2			134	4100	614	172	4138	576
97	4063	651	135	4101	613	Jan. 14		
98	4064	650	136	4102	612	173	4139	575
99	4065	649	Jan. 23			174	4140	574
100	4066	648	137	4103	611	175	4141	573
Feb. 1			138	4104	610	176	4142	572
101	4067	647	139	4105	609	Jan. 13		
102	4068	646	140	4106	608	177	4143	571
103	4069	645	Jan. 22			178	4144	570
104	4070	644	141	4107	607	179	4145	569
Jan. 31			142	4108	606	180	4146	568
105	4071	643	143	4109	605	Jan. 12		
106	4072	642	144	4110	604	181	4147	567
107	4073	641	Jan. 21			182	4148	566
108	4074	640	145	4111	603	183	4149	565
Jan. 30			146	4112	602	184	4150	564
109	4075	639	147	4113	601	Jan. 11		
110	4076	638	148	4114	600	185	4151	563
111	4077	637	Jan. 20			186	4152	562
112	4078	636	149	4115	599	187	4153	561
Jan. 29			150	4116	598	188	4154	560
113	4079	635	151	4117	597	Jan. 10		
114	4080	634	152	4118	596	189	4155	559
115	4081	633	Jan. 19			190	4156	558
116	4082	632	153	4119	595	191	4157	557
Jan. 28			154	4120	594	192	4158	556
117	4083	631	155	4121	593	Jan. 9		
118	4084	630	156	4122	592	193	4159	555
119	4085	629	Jan. 18			194	4160	554
120	4086	628	157	4123	591	195	4161	553
Jan. 27			158	4124	590	196	4162	552

Æra Nab.	Jul. Per.	B. C.	Æra Nab.	Jul. Per.	B. C.	Æra Nab.	Jul. Per.	B. C.
Jan. 8			Dec. 30			270	4235	479
197	4163	551	233	4198	516	271	4236	478
198	4164	550	234	4199	515	272	4237	477
199	4165	549	235	4200	514	Dec. 20		
200	4166	548	236	4201	513	273	4238	476
Jan. 7			Dec. 29			274	4239	475
201	4167	547	237	4202	512	275	4240	474
202	4168	546	238	4203	511	276	4241	473
203	4169	545	239	4204	510	Dec. 19		
204	4170	544	240	4205	509	277	4242	472
Jan. 6			Dec. 28			278	4243	471
205	4171	543	241	4206	508	279	4244	470
206	4172	542	242	4207	507	280	4245	469
207	4173	541	243	4208	506	Dec. 18		
208	4174	540	244	4209	505	281	4246	468
Jan. 5			Dec. 27			282	4247	467
209	4175	539	245	4210	504	283	4248	466
210	4176	538	246	4211	503	284	4249	465
211	4177	537	247	4212	502	Dec. 17		
212	4178	536	248	4213	501	285	4250	464
Jan. 4			Dec. 26			286	4251	463
213	4179	535	249	4214	500	287	4252	462
214	4180	534	250	4215	499	288	4253	461
215	4181	533	251	4216	4 8	Dec. 16		
216	4182	532	252	4217	497	289	4254	460
Jan. 3			Dec. 25			290	4255	459
217	4183	531	253	4218	496	291	4256	458
218	4184	530	254	4219	495	292	4257	457
219	4185	529	255	4220	494	Dec. 15		
220	4186	528	256	4221	493	293	4258	456
Jan. 2			Dec. 24			294	4259	455
221	4187	527	257	4222	492	295	4260	454
222	4188	526	258	4223	491	296	4261	453
223	4189	525	259	4224	490	Dec. 14		
224	4190	524	260	4225	489	297	4262	452
Jan. 1			Dec. 23			298	4263	451
225	4191	523	261	4226	488	299	4264	450
226	4192	522	262	4227	487	300	4265	449
227	4193	521	263	4228	486	Dec. 13		
	21 13		264	4229	485	301	4266	448
	C B		Dec. 22			302	4267	447
228	4194	520	265	4230	484	303	4268	446
Dec. 31			266	4231	483	304	4269	445
229	4194	520	267	4232	482	Dec. 12		
230	4195	519	268	4233	481	305	4270	444
231	4196	518	Dec. 21			306	4271	443
232	4197	517	269	4234	480	307	4272	442

Æra Nab.	Jul. Per.	B. C.	Æra Nab.	Jul. Per.	B. C.	Æra Nab.	Jul. Per.	B. C.
308	4273	441	345	4310	404	383	4348	366
Dec. 11			346	4311	403	384	4349	365
309	4274	440	347	4312	402	Nov. 22		
310	4275	439	348	4313	401	385	4350	364
311	4276	438	Dec. 1			386	4351	363
312	4277	437	349	4314	400	387	4352	362
Dec. 10			350	4315	399	388	4353	361
313	4278	436	351	4316	398	Nov. 21		
314	4279	435	352	4317	397	389	4354	360
315	4280	434	Nov. 30			390	4355	359
316	4281	433	353	4318	396	391	4356	358
Dec. 9			354	4319	395	392	4357	357
317	4282	432	355	4320	394	Nov. 20		
318	4283	431	356	4321	393	393	4358	356
319	4284	430	Nov. 29			394	4359	355
320	4285	429	357	4322	392	395	4360	354
Dec. 8			358	4323	391	396	4361	353
321	4286	428	359	4324	390	Nov. 19		
322	4287	427	360	4325	389	397	4362	352
323	4288	426	Nov. 28			398	4363	351
324	4289	425	361	4326	388	399	4364	350
Dec. 7			362	4327	387	400	4365	349
325	4290	424	363	4328	386	Nov. 18		
326	4291	423	364	4329	385	401	4366	348
327	4292	422	Nov. 27			402	4367	347
328	4293	421	365	4330	384	403	4368	346
Dec. 6			366	4331	383	404	4369	345
329	4294	420	367	4332	382	Nov. 17		
330	4295	419	368	4333	381	405	4370	344
331	4296	418	Nov. 26			406	4371	343
332	4297	417	369	4334	380	407	4372	342
Dec. 5			370	4335	379	408	4373	341
333	4298	416	371	4336	378	Nov. 16		
334	4299	415	372	4337	377	409	4374	340
335	4300	414	Nov. 25			410	4375	339
336	4301	413	373	4338	376	411	4376	338
Dec. 4			374	4339	375	412	4377	337
337	4302	412	375	4340	374	Nov. 15		
338	4303	411	376	4341	373	413	4378	336
339	4304	410	Nov. 24			414	4379	335
340	4305	409	377	4342	372	415	4380	334
Dec. 3			378	4343	371	416	4381	333
341	4306	408	379	4344	370	Nov. 14		
342	4307	407	380	4345	369	417	4382	332
343	4308	406	Nov. 23			418	4383	331
344	4309	405	381	4346	368	419	4384	330
Dec. 2			382	4347	367	420	4385	329

Æra Nab.	Jul. Per.	B. C.	Æra Nab.	Jul. Per.	B. C.	Æra Nab.	Jul. Per.	B. C.
Nov. 13			458	4423	291	496	4461	253
421	4386	328	459	4424	290	Oct. 25		
422	4387	327	460	4425	289	497	4462	252
423	4388	326	Nov. 3			498	4463	251
424	4389	325	461	4426	288	499	4464	250
Nov. 12			462	4427	287	500	4465	249
425	4390	324	463	4428	286	Oct. 24		
426	4391	323	464	4429	285	501	4466	248
427	4392	322	Nov. 2			502	4467	247
428	4393	321	465	4430	284	503	4468	246
Nov. 11			466	4431	283	504	4469	245
429	4394	320	467	4432	282	Oct. 23		
430	4395	319	468	4433	281	505	4470	244
431	4396	318	Nov. 1			506	4471	243
432	4397	317	469	4434	280	507	4472	242
Nov. 10			470	4435	279	508	4473	241
433	4398	316	471	4436	278	Oct. 22		
434	4399	315	472	4437	277	509	4474	240
435	4400	314	Oct. 31			510	4475	239
436	4401	313	473	4438	276	511	4476	238
Nov. 9			474	4439	275	512	4477	237
437	4402	312	475	4440	274	Oct. 21		
438	4403	311	476	4441	273	513	4478	236
439	4404	310	Oct. 30			514	4479	235
440	4405	309	477	4442	272	515	4480	234
Nov. 8			478	4443	271	516	4481	233
441	4406	308	479	4444	270	Oct. 20		
442	4407	307	480	4445	269	517	4482	232
443	4408	306	Oct. 29			518	4483	231
444	4409	305	481	4446	268	519	4484	230
Nov. 7			482	4447	267	520	4485	229
445	4410	304	483	4448	266	Oct. 19		
446	4411	303	484	4449	265	521	4486	228
447	4412	302	Oct. 28			522	4487	227
448	4413	301	485	4450	264	523	4488	226
Nov. 6			486	4451	263	524	4489	225
449	4414	300	487	4452	262	Oct. 18		
450	4415	299	488	4453	261	525	4490	224
451	4416	298	Oct. 27			526	4491	223
452	4417	297	489	4454	260	527	4492	222
Nov. 5			490	4455	259	528	4493	221
453	4418	296	491	4456	258	Oct. 17		
454	4419	295	492	4457	257	529	4494	220
455	4420	294	Oct. 26			530	4495	219
456	4421	293	493	4458	256	531	4496	218
Nov. 4			494	4459	255	532	4497	217
457	4422	292	495	4460	254	Oct. 16		

Era Nab.	Jul. Per.	B. C.	Era Nab.	Jul. Per.	B. C.	Era Nab.	Jul. Per.	B. C.
533	4498	216	571	4536	178	Sep. 27		
534	4499	215	572	4537	177	609	4574	140
535	4500	214	Oct. 6			610	4575	139
536	4501	213	573	4538	176	611	4576	138
Oct. 15			574	4539	175	612	4577	137
537	4502	212	575	4540	174	Sep. 26		
538	4503	211	576	4541	173	613	4578	136
539	4504	210	Oct. 5			614	4579	135
540	4505	209	577	4542	172	615	4580	134
Oct. 14			578	4543	171	616	4581	133
541	4506	208	579	4544	170	Sep. 25		
542	4507	207	580	4545	169	617	4582	132
543	4508	206	Oct. 4			618	4583	131
544	4509	205	581	4546	168	619	4584	130
Oct. 13			582	4547	167	620	4585	129
545	4510	204	583	4548	166	Sep. 24		
546	4511	203	584	4549	165	621	4586	128
547	4512	202	Oct. 3			622	4587	127
548	4513	201	585	4550	164	623	4588	126
Oct. 12			586	4551	163	624	4589	125
549	4514	200	587	4552	162	Sep. 23		
550	4515	199	588	4553	161	625	4590	124
551	4516	198	Oct. 2			626	4591	123
552	4517	197	589	4554	160	627	4592	122
Oct. 11			590	4555	159	628	4593	121
553	4518	196	591	4556	158	Sep. 22		
554	4519	195	592	4557	157	629	4594	120
555	4520	194	Oct. 1			630	4595	119
556	4521	193	593	4558	156	631	4596	118
Oct. 10			594	4559	155	632	4597	117
557	4522	192	595	4560	154	Sep. 21		
558	4523	191	596	4561	153	633	4598	116
559	4524	190	Sep. 30			634	4599	115
560	4525	189	597	4562	152	635	4600	114
Oct. 9			598	4563	151	636	4601	113
561	4526	188	599	4564	150	Sep. 20		
562	4527	187	600	4565	149	637	4602	112
563	4528	186	Sep. 29			638	4603	111
564	4529	185	601	4566	148	639	4604	110
Oct. 8			602	4567	147	640	4605	109
565	4530	184	603	4568	146	Sep. 19		
566	4531	183	604	4569	145	641	4606	108
567	4532	182	Sep. 28			642	4607	107
568	4533	181	605	4570	144	643	4608	106
Oct. 7			606	4571	143	644	4609	105
569	4534	180	607	4572	142	Sep. 18		
570	4535	179	608	4573	141	645	4610	104

Æra Nab.	Jul. Per.	B. C.	Æra Nab.	Jul. P. r.	B. C.	Æra Nab.	Jul. Per	B. C.
546	4611	103	681	4646	68	Aug. 31		
647	4612	102	682	4647	67	717	4682	32
648	4613	101	683	4648	66	718	4683	31
Sep. 17			684	4649	65	719	4684	30
649	4614	100	Sep. 8			720	4685	29
650	4615	99	685	4650	64	Aug. 30		
651	4616	98	686	4651	63	721	4686	28
652	4617	97	687	4652	62	722	4687	27
Sep. 16			688	4653	61	723	4688	26
653	4618	96	Sep. 7			724	4689	25
654	4619	95	689	4654	60	Aug. 29		
655	4620	94	690	4655	59	725	4690	24
656	4621	93	691	4656	58	726	4691	23
Sep. 15			692	4657	57	727	4692	22
657	4622	92	Sep. 6			728	4693	21
658	4623	91	693	4658	56	Aug. 28		
659	4624	90	694	4659	55	729	4694	20
660	4625	89	695	4660	54	730	4695	19
Sep. 14			696	4661	53	731	4696	18
661	4626	88	Sep. 5			732	4697	17
662	4627	87	697	4662	52	Aug. 27		
663	4628	86	698	4663	51	733	4698	16
664	4629	85	699	4664	50	734	4699	15
Sep. 13			700	4665	49	735	4700	14
665	4630	84	Sep. 4			736	4701	13
666	4631	83	701	4666	48	Aug. 26		
667	4632	82	702	4667	47	737	4702	12
668	4633	81	703	4668	46	738	4703	11
Sep. 12			704	4669	45	739	4704	10
669	4634	80	Sep. 3			740	4705	9
670	4635	79	705	4670	44	Aug. 25		
671	4636	78	706	4671	43	741	4706	8
672	4637	77	707	4672	42	742	4707	7
Sep. 11			708	4673	41	743	4708	6
673	4638	76	Sep. 2			744	4709	5
674	4639	75	709	4674	40	Aug. 24		
675	4640	74	710	4675	39	745	4710	4
676	4641	73	711	4676	38	746	4711	3
Sep. 10			712	4677	37	747	4712	2
677	4642	72	Sep. 1			748	4713	1
678	4643	71	713	4678	36	Aug. 23		
679	4644	70	714	4679	35			
680	4645	69	715	4680	34		4714	Christian
Sep. 9			716	4681	33			Æra.

Little need be said in explanation of the foregoing table. As the Egyptian years were nearly six hours shorter than the solar, at the end of four years the difference was nearly a day. Consequently their first month Thoth, which originally began at the heliacal rising of the constellation Sirius, would, as the extract from Petavius states, be carried, in the course of 1460 years, through every day in the year, until finally it would return again to its original place. This period was called the great Canicular year. When Egypt became a Roman province, their calendar was made to conform to that of Julius Cæsar, and, thenceforward, at Alexandria their first month Thoth always began on the 29th of August, because it fell on that day in the year when the Julian calendar was introduced; i. e., An. Nabon. 724, A. J. P. 4689, B. C. 25. But the astronomers, in order to avoid fractions, continued to use the Egyptian year of 365 days in their calculations. In order, therefore, to adjust the computations of Ptolemy to the modern, whether of the Julian Period, or of the years reckoned backward from the first of the common Christian era, it must be borne in mind, that 1460 of our years are equivalent to 1461 Egyptian years. Hence, in the preceding table, it will be found that the year of the Julian Period 4194 or B. C. 520 is counted twice, because the preceding year, corresponding with the year of Nabonassar 227, was Bissextile. In that year the first of Thoth coincided with the first of January; but the next year of Nabonassar 228 began on the 31st of December of the same Julian year. To avoid confusion, therefore, it was necessary to reckon B. C. 520 twice. The reader will easily see this, if he notices that the sums of the year of the Julian Period and the year before Christ must, if correct, always amount to 4714.

The accuracy of the whole computation may be proved as follows:

It is evident that in the year B. C. 747, 56 days (Jan. 31 + Feb. 25 = 56) had elapsed before the first Egyptian year of the era of Nabonassar began; and it is no less evident, from the preceding table, that the 748th year of Nabonassar began on the 23d of August, B. C. 1, and

consequently ended on the 22d of August, A. J. P. 4714, or the first of the common Christian era. On the 23d of August of that year began the 749th year of Nabonassar. The whole number of days from January 1 to August 22 inclusive, in A. J. P. 4714, as it was not Bissextile, was 234, and these are obviously to be deducted. The number of days in 748 solid years of Nabonassar, (748×365), is 273,020. From these deduct 234 days, and add the 56 days which had elapsed in the year B. C. 747 before the era of Nabonassar began, and you have the number of days in 747 solid Julian years, amounting to 272,842. This sum divided by 1461, the number of days in four Julian years, gives 186 Bissextile periods, or (186×4) 744 years and a remainder of 1096 days. Of the first three years B. C., or the years 4713, 4712, and 4711 of the Julian Period, one was a Bissextile. Therefore that year had 366 days; and the two other years 365 days each. Consequently the remainder above-mentioned of 1096 days is exactly equal to the sum of the days in the years B. C. 1, 2, and 3; and $744 + 3 = 747$ solid Julian years. Q. E. D.

Having thus synchronized the modern computations of time with the era of Nabonassar down to the Christian era, we proceed to the first table of

PTOLEMY'S CANON OF KINGS

compared with the Astronomical Canon and Ecclesiastical Computation given by Syncellus.

PTOLEMY.				SYNCELLUS.					
No	Of the Assyrians and Medes.	Years of each reign.	Sum of years.	No	Astronomical Canon.	Years of each reign.	No	Ecclesiastical Computation.	Years of each reign.
1	Nabonassar	14	14	1	Nabonassar	14	1	Nabonassar, who in Scripture is called Salmanassar	25
2	Nadius	2	16	2	Nabius	2	2	Nabius	8
3	Chozirius, or Chinzirius and Porus	5	21	3	Chinzerus and Porus	5	3	Chinzerus and Porus	5
4	Jugeus	5	26	4	Hulæus	5	4	Hulæus	5
5	Mardoc Empadus	12	38	5	Mardocempadus	12	5	Mardocempadocus	12
6	Artianus	5	43	6	Arceanus	5	6	Arceanus	5
First Interregnum		2	45	First Interregnum		2	First Interregnum		2
7	Belibus	3	48	7	Belithus	3	7	Belelus [or Belethus]	3
8	Apronadius	6	54	8	Aporanadius	6	8	Aparanadius	6
9	Rigebelus	1	55	9	Irigebalus	1	9	Iregiballus	1
10	Mesessimordacus	4	59	10	Mesessimordacus	4	10	Mesessimordacus	4
Second Interregnum		8	67	Second Interregnum		8	Second Interregnum		8
11	Assar Adinus	13	80	11	Isarindinus	13	11	Isaridennus	13
12	Saosducheus	20	100	12	Saosduchius	13	12	Saos Duchius	13
13	Chynliadanus	22	122	13	Cinliadatus	14	13	Cinladanas	14
14	Nabopollassarus	21	143	14	Nabopolassar	21	14	Nabopalassar	21
15	Nabocollassarus	43	186	15	Nabupalasar or Nabuchodonosor	43	15	Nabuchodonosor, his son	43
16	Iluarodanus	2	188	16	Iluaradanus (donosor)	3	16	Ebidan Merodach	5
17	Niricassolassarus	4	192	17	Nerogassolasar	5	17	Nireglesarus, or Baltasar	5
18	Nabonadius	17	209	18	Nabonadius or Astyages	34	18	Nabonadius, who is also Astyages, Darius, Assuerus, or Artaxerxes	17
Sum of reigns		209		Sum of reigns		209	Sum of reigns		209

The above canon of Ptolemy is copied from the edition with various readings published by Petavius, from manuscripts in the king of France's library, in the second volume of his *Rationarium Temporum*. His text accords with the "*Canon Chronicus Babyloniorum Regum ex Cod. MS. Cl. Ptolemæi de Hypothesibus Planetarum*," &c., given by Sir John Marsham, and first published by Dr. Bambridge from a manuscript in the Bodleian Library. By the side of this I have placed two lists from the Paris edition of Syncellus, p. 207-9. The first is called by that author the *Astronomical Canon*, and is no other than the Canon of Ptolemy corrupted. The last, which he calls the *Ecclesiastical Computation*, was taken by him from a work, now lost, of Julius Africanus. It is satisfactory to compare them; but the reader must not be misled by the attempts made, either in the *Astronomical Canon*, or the *Ecclesiastical computation*, to reconcile the names they contain with those in the Scriptures. Let him not for a moment suppose that Nabonassar and Shalmaneser were the same person; that the seventeenth king was Baltazar or Belshazzar; or that the eighteenth, was the same as Astyages, Darius, Assuerus, or Artaxerxes. It is these unskillful attempts which have thrown the subject into so much confusion, and occasioned among modern chronologers so many conflicting opinions. The Canon of Ptolemy, taken by itself, is an illustrious monument of antiquity, perfectly in accordance with Scripture history, and furnishing the only sure method by which we can adjust its dates with the modern computations of time. To this, therefore, let us confine ourselves.

There can be no doubt, I think, that the Nabocolasarus of Ptolemy is the Nebuchadnezzar of the Bible. The Greek L and D (Λ and Δ) are so nearly alike, that a Greek copyist unskilled in Hebrew names would very easily mistake the one for the other. For Nabocod-nassar, or, as he is called in the Septuagint, Nabocod-nosor, it would be easy to write Nabocolassar. Further proofs will appear hereafter. By a similar process it would not be difficult to change Esar Haddon into Assar Addin.

According, then, to the Canon of Ptolemy, the first year of Nebuchadnezzar coincides with the 144th year of Nabonassar, which began, by our table, January 21, A. J. P. 4110, B. C. 604. It appears from Jeremiah xxv. 1, compared with Daniel i. 1, that the first year of Nebuchadnezzar corresponded with the end of the third and beginning of "the fourth year of Jehoiakim the son of Josiah king of Judah." This might well be, if the years of the Jewish monarchs were counted from the month Nisan, which began with the new moon nearest to the vernal Equinox. The nineteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar, corresponding with the eleventh year of Zedekiah (2 Kings, xxv. 2, 8), and the year in which the Temple was destroyed, was the 162d of Nabonassar, and began January 17, A. J. P. 4128, B. C. 586. As it was the eleventh year of Zedekiah, that king began to reign A. Nab. 152, which began January 19, A. J. P. 4118, B. C. 596. Without counting the short reign of Jehoiachin, of three months and ten days, the reign of Jehoiakim began eleven years earlier, A. Nab. 141. This accords perfectly with the testimony of Jeremiah and Daniel as we have reconciled that testimony; for in the first year of Nebuchadnezzar, A. Nab. 144, the fourth year of Jehoiakim began at the vernal Equinox. Consequently,

The third year of Jehoiakim began at the vernal	
Equinox,	A. Nab. 143
The second year of	" 142
The first	" 141
The year of Nabonassar 141 began Jan. 22, A. J. P. 4107, B. C. 607.	

Josiah reigned 31 years, bringing up the period to the vernal Equinox, if we make no allowance for the three months' reign of Jehoahaz, A. Nab. 110, beginning January 30, A. J. P. 4076, B. C. 638. Amon began to reign A. Nab. 108, A. J. P. 4074, B. C. 640. Manasseh reigned fifty-five years, from A. Nab. 53, which began Feb. 13, A. J. P. 4019, B. C. 695. Hezekiah began to reign A. Nab. 24, which commenced Feb. 20, A. J. P. 3990, B. C. 724. The reign of Ahaz began 16 years earlier, A. Nab. 8, Feb. 24, A. J. P. 3974, B. C. 740; and as Jotham reigned 16 years, his reign commenced

A. J. P. 3958, B. C. 756; so that the first year of the era of Nabonassar coincided with his tenth.

Having traced thus far the reigns of the kings of Judah, let us now turn to the affairs of the kingdom of Israel. Samaria was taken by Shalmaneser, (2 Kings, xviii. 10), in the sixth year of Hezekiah, and the ninth year of Hoshea king of Israel. If Hezekiah began to reign in the twenty-fourth year of Nabonassar, his sixth year would begin A. Nab. 29, which would be the ninth of Hoshea, and consequently the first of Hoshea would be A. Nab. 21, A. J. P. 3987, B. C. 727. Allowing, then, with Dr. Hales an interregnum of ten years between Hoshea and Pekah, that interregnum would have commenced A. J. P. 3977, B. C. 737, and the twentieth year of Pekah would have coincided with A. J. P. 3976, B. C. 738. Consequently the first year of Pekah would be A. J. P. 3957, B. C. 757, and the first year of the era of Nabonassar, A. J. P. 3967, B. C. 747, would be the eleventh of Pekah's reign; which is correct.

But there is an error in this ascending series which that eminent chronologer seems to have overlooked when he made the interregnum between Pekah and Hoshea ten years. This error we must correct by tracing the series downwards in connection with the collateral reigns of the kings of Judah.

It appears from 2 Kings, xv. 32, that "Jotham the son of Uzziah king of Judah began to reign in the second year of Pekah the son of Remaliah king of Israel." Jotham began to reign, as we have seen, A. J. P. 3958, B. C. 756. Consequently Pekah began to reign the year before, A. J. P. 3957, B. C. 757. The tenth year of Jotham was therefore the eleventh of Pekah, and the twentieth of Pekah the year 10 of Nabonassar, A. J. P. 3976, B. C. 738, as we have seen by the ascending series. So far all is correct. But it appears by 2 Kings, xvi. 1, that Ahaz began to reign in Judah in the seventeenth year of Pekah, and as the first year of Nabonassar was the eleventh of Pekah, so the seventh of Nabonassar A. J. P. 3973, B. C. 741, was the seventeenth of Pekah, and therefore the first of Ahaz. By the ascending series, the reign of Ahaz began the next year. This difficulty is obviated by

considering the reign of Ahaz as probably beginning towards the close of the year 7 of Nabonassar, A. J. P. 3973, B. C. 741. Pekah reigned 20 years, and therefore died three years after the accession of Ahaz, A. Nab. 10, A. J. P. 3976, B. C. 738. But by 2 Kings, xvii. 1, Hoshea began to reign in the twelfth year of Ahaz. This was towards the close of the year 19 of Nabonassar; so that the interregnum between Pekah and Hoshea was nine years, and not ten, as Dr. Hales supposes. Consequently the ninth year of Hoshea would end towards the close of the year 28 of Nabonassar, or part of a year earlier than the date we arrived at in our upward progress. We must therefore place the extinction of the kingdom of Israel in the autumn of the year 3994 of the Julian Period, or B. C. 720. This was the sixth year of Hezekiah, and his reign may have commenced towards autumn of the year 23 of Nabonassar, A. J. P. 3989, B. C. 725.

Before the era of Nabonassar we count back thus: First, ten years of Pekah+two of Pekahiah+ten of Menahem=22 years. Menahem began to reign, according to 2 Kings, xv. 14, 17, by the death of Shallum, in the thirty-ninth year of Azariah. Therefore the first of Menahem and thirty-ninth of Azariah coincided with A. J. P. 3945, B. C. 769; and the thirty-eighth year of Azariah, in which Zachariah reigned over Israel, (2 Kings, xv. 8), was A. J. P. 3944, B. C. 770. Azariah, therefore, began to reign (3944—37 or 770+37) in A. J. P. 3907 or B. C. 807: and that year, by 2 Kings, xv. 1, was the twenty-seventh year of Jeroboam II. king of Israel. Jeroboam reigned 41 years. If therefore A. J. P. 3907, B. C. 807, was his twenty-seventh year, then his last year was (3907+14) A. J. P. 3921, B. C. 793. Consequently the difference between A. J. P. 3944, B. C. 770, the year when Zachariah reigned, and A. J. P. 3921, B. C. 793, the last year of Jeroboam II., or *twenty three* years, was the period of interregnum in Israel between Jeroboam II. and Zachariah and Shallum, and not *twenty-two* years as stated by Dr. Hales. There were evidently two interregnums at least in Israel; and the sum of both is equal to 32 years, as Dr. Hales has said. The

only incorrectness in his computation was in making them $22+10$ instead of $23+9$ years.

Between the reigns of Amaziah and Azariah in Judah, was the regency of eleven years. It began A. J. P. 3896, B. C. 818, and continued until A. J. P. 3906, or B. C. 808 inclusive. The reign of Amaziah, of 29 years, began A. J. P. 3867, B. C. 847. The reign of Jehoash of 40 years, began A. J. P. 3827, B. C. 887; and that of Athaliah, for 6 years, A. J. P. 3821, B. C. 893. In the same year began Jehu to reign over Israel. Thus we have established the epoch of the second period in the collateral reigns of the kings of Judah and Israel; a period extending to the sixth of Hezekiah and the ninth of Hoshea inclusive, or from A. J. P. 3821, B. C. 893, to A. J. P. 3994, B. C. 720, inclusive, or 174 solid years. In this way we test our previous ascending series of years, and find that there cannot be any important error in our computation.

Assuming then the beginning of A. J. P. 3821, B. C. 893, as the commencement of the second period, and recollecting that the first period from Rehoboam and Jeroboam to Athaliah and Jehu was adjusted so as to measure 95 complete or solid years, it will then follow that $3821-95$ or $893+95$ will give the first year of Rehoboam and Jeroboam, A. J. P. 3726, B. C. 988. Hence the first year of Solomon was $3726-40$ or $988+40=A. J. P. 3686$, B. C. 1028; and the foundation of the Temple having been laid in the fourth year of Solomon, that event took place $(3686+3$ or $1028-3)$ A. J. P. 3689, B. C. 1025. We have before seen that the Temple stood 440 years, and that it was destroyed in the year of Nabonassar 162, corresponding with A. J. P. 4128, B. C. 586. Subtract from or add to these several sums $440-1=439$, and the result is the same, A. J. P. 3689, B. C. 1025, as the epoch of the foundation of Solomon's Temple.

Having now traced the ascending series until we arrive at an age of the world explicitly marked in the chronology of the Bible, whatever computation we may choose to follow, whether of the Jewish-Hebrew, the Samaritan-Hebrew, or the Septuagint, we proceed again by the descending series to trace the collateral reigns

of the kings of Judah and Israel during the first period of 95 years.

No.	Kings of Judah.	A. J. P.	B. C.	No.	Kings of Israel.	A. J. P.	B. C.
1	Rehoboam 17 yrs. 1 Kings xiv. 25— Rehoboam be- came tributary to Shishak or Sheshonk, king of Egypt, in the 5th year of his reign, . . .	3726	988	1	Jeroboam 22 yrs.	3726	988
2	Abijam 3 years, .	3730	984				
3	Asa 41 years, .	3743	971				
		3746	968	2	Nadab 2 years,	3748	966
				3	Baasha 24, com- puted as 23 yrs.	3750	964
				4	Elah 2 current, 1 complete year	3773	941
				5	Zimri and Omri, 12 current, 11 complete years,	3774	940
4	Jehoshaphat 25 years, . . .	3787	927	6	Ahab 22 years,	3785	929
				7	Ahaziah 2 years,	3807	907
5	Jehoram 8 years,	3812	902	8	Jehoram 12 years,	3809	905
6	Ahaziah 1 year,	3820	894				
	Athaliah . . .	3821	893		Jehu, . . .	3821	893

Second period of the kings of Judah and Israel, embracing 174 solid years.

No.	Kings of Judah.	A. J. P.	B. C.	No.	Kings of Israel.	A. J. P.	B. C.
	Athaliah 6 years,	3821	893	9	Jehu 28 years,	3821	893
7	Jehoash or Joash, 40 years, .	3827	887				
				10	Jehoahaz 17 yrs.	3849	865
				11	Jehoash or Joash, 16 years, .	3865	849
8	Amaziah 29 years	3867	847	12	Jeroboam II., 41 years, . . .	3881	833
	Regency during the minority of Azariah, 11 yrs. begins . . .	3896	818				

No.	Kings of Judah.	A. J. P.	B. C.	No.	Kings of Israel.	A. J. P.	B. C.
9	Azariah, or Uz- ziah, begins to reign in the 27th year of Je- roboam II. and reigns 52 years,	3907	807				
					The first interreg- num begins af- ter the death of Jeroboam II. & continues 23 years, from .	3921	793
					Zachariah and Shallum reign for 7 months in the 38th year of Azariah, .	3944	770
					Menahem begins to reign in the 39th year of Azariah, and reigns 10 years,	3945	769
					Pekahiah 2 years,	3955	759
					Pekah the son of Remaliah, 20 y.	3957	757
10	Jotham, . . .	3958	756				
	The era of Nabo- nassar begins the 10th year of Jotham, .	3967	747		The era of Nabo- nassar begins the 11th year of Pekah, .	3967	747
11	Ahaz 16 years, E. N. 7, begins in the 17th year of Pekah, . .	3973	741				
					Pekah slain in the 20th year of his reign, E. N. 10,	3976	738
					The second inter- regnum begins after the death of Pekah, and continues 9 yrs.		
					Hoshea began to reign in the 12th year of Ahaz, towards the close of the 19th year of Nabonassar,	3985	729

N	Kings of Judah.	A. J. P.	B. C.	N	Kings of Israel.	A. J. P.	B. C.
12	Hezekiah began to reign yr. 23 of Nabonassar, The extinction of the kingdom of Israel takes place in the autumn, being in the 6th current year of Hezekiah, . . .	3989	725		The extinction of the kingdom of Israel takes place in the autumn, being the close of the 9th year of Hoshea, E. N. 28.	3994	720
	Duration of the second period, from the 1st of Athaliah to the 6th of Hezekiah, current inclusive, from A. J. P. 3821 to 3994, inclusive, or 174 yrs.				Duration of the second period, from the 1st of Jehu to the close of the 9th of Hoshea, inclusive, from B. C. 893 to B. C. 720, inclusive, or 893—719=174 years.		

Third period, kings of Judah alone, 134 years.

	The third period begins after the destruction of the kingdom of Israel,	3994	719
13	Manasseh reigns 55 years, beginning E. N. 53 . . .	4019	695
14	Amon reigns 2 years, beginning E. N. 108 . . .	4074	640
15	Josiah reigns 31 years, beginning E. N. 110 . . .	4076	638
16	Jehoahaz reigning only 3 months, is not counted.		
17	Jehoiakim reigns 11 years, beginning E. N. 141 . .	4107	607
18	Jehoiakin reigning only 3 months and 10 days, is not counted.		
19	Zedekiah reigns 11 years, beginning E. N. 152 . .	4118	596
	The destruction of Jerusalem takes place E. N. 162	4128	586
	Duration of the third period, from after the destruction of the kingdom of Israel to the 11th current year of Zedekiah, inclusive, or from A. J. P. 3995 to A. J. P. 4128, inclusive. 4129—3995=134 years, B. C. 719—585=134 years.		
	The first period from Rehoboam=years	95	
	The second period " Athaliah=" "	174	
	The third period " Hezekiah VI.=" "	134	
		403	
	The Temple being founded in the 4th year of Solomon, add 40—3=37 . . .	37	
	And it makes the duration of the Temple	440	years.
	The kingdom of Israel continued 95+174=	269	years.
	The kingdom of Judah from Rehoboam to Zedekiah	403	
	From David to Zedekiah, 40+40+403 . . .	483	

It was necessary to adjust the chronology of Judah and Israel before proceeding to consider that of the Assyrian Empire, that we might bring the Bible to our assistance in clearing our path through the tangled cop-pice of early profane history. The ancient historians and chronologers were led astray by the fabulous narrative of Ctesias. The whole account of the ancient Assyrian Empire in the second book of Diodorus Siculus rests upon that author as its only authority. It was impos-sible to reconcile the statements of Ctesias with those of Herodotus; and the veracity of the last-named venerable historian was inconsiderately called in question on the testimony of a writer of romance, supported by the opinion of (in that instance) the prejudiced Plutarch.

This injustice has extended even to our own times. Not to mention Rollin and a crowd of inferior writers, it influenced even the great and truly learned Arch-bishop Usher. But without entering into the tedious and almost interminable path of correcting errors, let us confine our attention to the truths which the mental conflicts of the learned have struck out and established.

The idea of a great Assyrian Empire extending back almost to the times of the Deluge, is universally exploded. It is not only unsupported by the Holy Scriptures, but is absolutely contradicted by them. The kings of ancient times, as Sir John Marsham observes, were as numerous as the cities: "*quot urbes, tot regna.*" Egypt and Israel excepted, there were no united nations. The kingdoms of Nineveh and Babylon consisted each of one mighty city with its environs. Bryant calls them "walled provinces. The people ploughed and sowed, and had fruits and pastures within their walls."*

The whole book of Genesis contains not a syllable concerning any great Assyrian Empire; nor are there traces of any such name as a kingdom even of Assyria, until we come to 2 Kings, xv. 19, and 2 Chron. xxviii. 16. The earliest prophet speaks only of a kingdom of Nineveh (Jonah i. 2, iii. 2-10, iv. 11); nor do we hear

* Bryant's Analysis of Ancient Mythology. 8vo. Ed. 3. Lond. 1807. Vol. ii. p. 375.

of a king of Assyria residing at Nineveh as his capital, till we come to the prophecy of Nahum, in which the destruction of that great city is so sublimely predicted. (Nahum iii. 18). When the Jews were newly returned from the Babylonian Captivity, they thus confessed their sins: "Now therefore our God——let not all the trouble seem little before thee, that hath come upon us, on our kings, on our princes, and on our priests, and on our prophets, and on our fathers, and on all thy people, *since the time of the kings of Assyria unto this day.*" Nehem. ix. 32. Hence Sir Isaac Newton infers that "the Assyrian Empire arose" about the time "when the kings of Assyria began to afflict the inhabitants of Palestine." This, according to 2 Kings, xv. 19, was when "Pul the king of Assyria came against the land," early in the reign of Menahem king of Israel. The first year of Menahem, as we have before seen, coincided with A. J. P. 3945, B. C. 769. That is the earliest limit of time in which Pul can have crossed the Euphrates; and it was the twenty-second year before the era of Nabonassar, the 220th year after the revolt of the ten tribes, and the fiftieth year before the extinction of the kingdom of Israel.

Pul is with reason supposed to be the Belus of the Greeks. The letters B and P being both labials, are frequently interchanged; and the Greek termination being removed, there is little difference between Bel and Pul. The subsequent names of the Assyrian monarchs are compounds. Tiglath Pileser is equivalent to Tiglath-Pul-Assur, which means, according to Dr. Hales, "the tyger-lord of Assyria." Shalmaneser, or Shalman-Assur, is called by Hosea (x. 14) simply Shalman. The succession of Assyrian kings mentioned in the Scriptures is

- I. Pul, or Phul, 2 Kings, xv. 19, 1 Chron. v. 26.
- II. Tiglath Pileser, 2 Kings, xv. 29, 1 Chron. v. 26, 2 Chron. xxviii. 20.
- III. Shalmaneser, 2 Kings, xvii. 3, xviii. 9.
- IV. Sennacherib, 2 Kings, xviii. 13, xix. 36, 2 Chron. xxxii. 1, Isaiah, xxxvi.
- V. Esar Haddon, 2 Kings, xix. 37, Isaiah, xxxvii. 38.

This succession is clearly supported by the fragments of the Chaldæan Historians preserved by Josephus and Eusebius, and copied from them by succeeding writers. The books of Josephus against Apion are generally known to English readers by means of Whiston's Translation. A useful collection of ancient fragments of the Phœnician, Chaldæan, Egyptian,—and other writers, was published, with an English translation, by Isaac Preston Cory, Esq., which came to a second edition in London in 1832. All the sources from which Mr. Cory compiled his work are in the hands of the present writer; and he proceeds to insert here such portions of them as may serve to illustrate the Scripture history. This done, he will endeavor to show the general harmony of the whole.

Extract from Alexander Polyhistor concerning the building of the Tower of Babel preserved by Eusebius. Præp. Evang. ix. 15, and Chronicon. P. 1. Ed. Venice. Tom. 1. p. 41.

“After whom, he says, there was a king of the Chaldæans whose name was Phulus: of whom, also, the historical writings of the Hebrews make mention under the name of Phulus (Pul), who, they say, invaded the country of the Jews.

“And after him Polyhistor says that Senecheribus was king. Both Isaiah the prophet and the books of the Hebrews relate that he reigned in the time of king Hezekiah. For the Divine Scripture proceeds to say, ‘And it came to pass in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah the king, that Sinecherib, king of the Assyrians, went up against the fortified cities of Judæa and took them.’ And after the whole history it adds thus: ‘And Asordan, his son, reigned in his stead.’ And likewise further on it adds, ‘In that time it came to pass that Hezekiah fell sick.’ It then relates in order that ‘In that time Marodach Baladan, king of the Babylonians, sent ambassadors with a letter and presents to Hezekiah.’ These things say the writings of the Hebrews.

“The Chaldæan historian also makes mention of Sine-

cherib himself and Asordanus, his son, and Marodach Baladanus, as well as Nabuchodonosorus."

"*From the same Alexander concerning Senecherib and Nabuchodonosor, and concerning their acts and qualities.*" Chronicon. P. 1. Ed. Venice, p. 42. Tom. 1.

"After the brother of Senecharib had reigned; and after Acises (Ed. Milan says, Hagises) had ruled over the Babylonians and was killed by Marodach Baladan when he had not held the kingdom thirty days; and Marodach Baladan himself had held it by force six months; he was killed by one Elibus, who reigned in his stead. But in the third year of his reign, Senecheribus, king of the Assyrians, raised an army against the Babylonians, conquered him in battle, and ordered him to be carried captive with his friends into the land of the Assyrians.

"Having thus the dominion over the Babylonians, he appointed his son Asordanius their king, and he himself retired again into the land of the Assyrians.

"When he had received a report that the Greeks had made a hostile descent upon Cilicia, he marched against them, and fought with them a pitched battle, in which, though he suffered great loss in his own army, he overthrew them, and, as a monument of the victory, left his own statue erected upon the spot, ordering an inscription to be engraven upon it in Chaldee characters, as a memorial to future time of his fortitude and courage. He founded, also, the city of Tarsus, after the likeness of Babylon, which he called Tharsis.' And after relating all the exploits of Sinnecherim, he adds that 'when he had lived 18 years (in empire) he departed this life by the plots which his son Ardumusanus had prepared against him.' Thus far Polyhistor."

Eusebius then adds: "This account of time agrees with the words of the Divine Scriptures. For under Hezekiah 'reigned Sinecherim,' as Polyhistor sets forth, '18 years, and, after him, his son, 8 years. Next Sammuges (the Milan ed. says Sammughes) 21 years, and his brother 21 years. Then Nabupalsar 20 years, and

after him Nabucodrossorus 43 years. From Sinecherim to Nabucodrossorus there are comprehended in all 88 years.

"According to the books of the Hebrews also, if any one diligently examines, he will find the like things." Eusebius proceeds to compute the united reigns of Manassas, Amos or Amon, and Josiah, as amounting to 88 years, and then states that Nebuchadnezzar came and besieged Jerusalem in the beginning of the reign of Jehoiakim, and carried the Jews captive. He then gives a further extract from Polyhistor as follows:

"After Samuges (the Milan ed. again reads Sammughes) Sardanapallus, the Chaldæan, reigned 21 years. He sent an army to the aid of Astyages,* the Mede, who was the prince and satrap of the race (familiæ) that he might give Amuhean, the daughter of Astyages, in marriage to his son Nabucodrossor. And then Nabucodrossor reigned 43 years, and, coming with his collected forces, he led captive the Jews and Phœnicians and Syrians. * * * *

"And after Nabucodrossor reigned his son Amilmardoch 12 years, (whom the history of the Hebrews calls Ilmarodoch.) And after him, says Polyhistor, Neglisar reigned over the Chaldæans four years, and afterwards Nabodenus 17 years. Under whom Cyrus, the son of Cambyses, led an army into the land of the Babylonians. Nabodenus went out to meet him, and being conquered took to flight. Cyrus reigned at Babylon 9 years; and then, in another engagement, died on the field Daas. After him Cambyses reigned 8 years, and then Darius 36 years; after whom Xerxes and the other kings of the Persians."

"Moreover Polyhistor describes the several events with as much brevity as Berosus; and it appears from both that Nabuchodonosor collected forces and carried the Jews captive; and that 70 years were comprised from this time to that of Cyrus the king of the Persians.

* The Milan edition reads Asdahages, and in a note Asdahagh, the president and satrap of the Median nation, race or tribe.

And with these the history of the Hebrews agrees; viz. that they passed 70 years in captivity, if you compute the captivity of the Jews from the first year of Nabuchodonosor to Cyrus king of the Persians. Abydenus relates the same thing in his history of the Chaldæans."

I omit the extracts from Abydenus, because they contain no dates, and, as Eusebius observes above, agree in substance with the narrative of Polyhistor. The succession of kings from Nebuchadnezzar, according to this author, was, 1. Nabucodonosor; 2. Amil-Marodoc (Ed. Milan. Amil-Marodach, Greek, Evil-Maluruchus); 3. Niglissar, (Gr. Neriglissar); 4. Labossoracus, (Gr. Labassoarascus); 5. Nabonedoch, (Gr. Nabannidochus); 6. Cyrus, &c.

I also omit the extracts from Josephus against Apion B. 1, because Whiston's translation is in everybody's hands; but as in the years of Nabopolassar the present copies of Josephus read 29 for 21, I give the extract from Berosus as it appears in the Evangelical Preparation of Eusebius, Lib. ix. c. 40. The Armenian version of the Chronicon of Eusebius has also 21 and not 29, as the number of years of the reign of Nabopolassar. The mistake can easily be accounted for; being occasioned by writing *έννεα* for *ένα* or *θ* for *α*.

Extract from Berosus.

"Nabuchodonosor, warring against an insurgent, overcame him and reduced the country under his dominion. About this time it came to pass that his father Nabopolassar was taken ill and died in the City of Babylon when he had reigned 21 years. Nabuchodonosor, having been soon informed of his father's death, arranged affairs in Egypt and the neighboring countries, and having confided the Jewish, Phœnician and Syrian captives to the care of some of his friends, returned to Babylon."

Eusebius then passes over the account extracted by Josephus from Berosus, that Nebuchadnezzar built the famous hanging gardens and walls of Babylon, and proceeds as follows:

"After other matters he says: Nabuchodonosor, after he had begun the before-mentioned wall, fell sick and died, when he had reigned 43 years.

"His son Evil-maluruchus (Jos. Evil-maraduchus) succeeded him, who, presiding over affairs disorderly and licentiously, was assassinated insidiously by Neriglissar, who had married his sister, when he had reigned two years. After his murder the conspirator Neriglissar succeeded to the empire and reigned four years. His son Chabaessoarachos (Jos. Laborosoarchodus) governed the kingdom, being a boy, nine months; but on account of his depraved habits, which were very conspicuous, he was conspired against and privately killed by his own friends. After his death the conspirators assembled and agreed to invest with the sovereignty Nabonnidus, one of the Babylonians engaged in the conspiracy. Under him, the walls of the City of Babylon towards the river were adorned with a facing of brick and asphaltum. In the 17th year of his reign, Cyrus of Persia came with a great host, and having overturned the rest of his kingdom, marched upon Babylon. Nabonnidus, informed of his approach, met him with his army; but being vanquished in fight, and escaping with a few companions, he shut himself up in the City of the Borsippeni. Cyrus, having taken Babylon, and having ordered the outermost wall to be thrown down, because the city seemed to him exceedingly hard to be taken, moved towards Borsippum to besiege Nabonnidus. But Nabonnidus, not awaiting a siege, gave himself up to Cyrus, who treated him kindly, and gave him Caramania, where he remained the rest of his life.

"This narrative, says Josephus, agrees with our books; for it is written in them that Nabuchodonosor, in the eighteenth year of his reign, laid waste our temple, and it was thus destroyed for fifty years. But the foundations being laid in the second year of Cyrus, it was completed at length in the tenth year of the reign of Darius."

It would be easy to add more authorities of this nature; but these extracts from three of the ancient Chaldæan historians are sufficient, in connection with

the Canon of Ptolemy, to exhibit the admirable accuracy of the Scripture history even where that accuracy has been the most strongly doubted. I allude to the account given in 2 Kings, xx. 12-19, and in Isaiah, xxxix, and merely noticed very briefly but remarkably in 2 Chron. xxxii. 31.

It appears, that after the discomfiture of Sennacherib in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah, and the severe illness of that monarch, which, as his life was prolonged fifteen years, must have immediately followed, an embassy was sent to him from Babylon. It was sent, according to 2 Kings, xx. 12. by Berodach Baladan, king of Babylon; according to Isaiah, xxxix. 1, by Merodach Baladan, king of Babylon; and according to 2 Chron. xxxii. 31, by the princes of Babylon. This excited a sinful pride in the heart of Hezekiah, made him forgetful for a while of his dependence upon God, and drew down upon him the displeasure of the Almighty. Previous to the publication in 1818 of the Armenian translation of the Chronicon of Eusebius, the name of such a king of Babylon as Merodach Baladan was not to be found in any of the profane historians. The Canon of Ptolemy contained it not. This fact was triumphantly alleged as an instance of contradiction between that celebrated Canon and the Holy Scriptures. The Chronologus, even as late as Dr. Hales, tried to find the Merodach Baladan of the Bible in the Mardoc-Empad of Ptolemy. And thus the whole chronology of that period was thrown into disorder, when lo! by the discovery in 1818 of the extract given above from Alexander Polyhistor, preserved nowhere else but in the Chronicon of Eusebius, the whole difficulty is at once removed, the obscurity cleared up, and the chronology adjusted with the most wonderful accuracy!

We learn from the Canon of Ptolemy that there was an interregnum of two years in the kingdom of Babylon from E. N. 44 to 46, or from A. J. P. 4010, B. C. 704, to A. J. P. 4012, B. C. 702. Ptolemy adds that a king named Belibus reigned for three years, E. N. 46, 47, 48, or from A. J. P. 4012, B. C. 702, to A. J. P. 4014, B. C. 700 inclusive. Now compare this with Polyhistor's narrative and the

Bible. After the brother of Sennacherib had reigned, whose name he does not give, but who, it may be presumed, was the Arkianus or Arkian of Ptolemy, there was a state of oligarchy and faction at Babylon rightly referred to in 2 Chron. xxxii. 31, and there aptly designated as a time when "the princes of Babylon" ruled. They had doubtless put Arkianus the brother of Sennacherib to death. In the progress of this anarchy, Acises seized the kingdom, but was killed, after he had reigned scarcely a month, by another of the princes Merodach Baladan the son of Baladan. He retained the kingdom by force only six months, and was then in his turn put to death by Elibus, the Belibus of Ptolemy, another of the insurgent princes, who, according to both accounts, held the sovereignty three years. Ptolemy never mentions any reign which did not continue for at least a year. He therefore passes over Acises and Merodach Baladan in silence, but mentions Belibus or Elibus because his reign continued three years. It was during the six months' reign of Merodach Baladan that, wishing to strengthen himself against Sennacherib, whose power and vengeance he justly dreaded, he sent the embassy to Hezekiah recorded in the Scriptures. That event happened therefore during the last six months which preceded the reign of Belibus; that is, in the last half of E. N. 45, or A. J. P. 4011, B. C. 703. Hezekiah began to reign, as we have seen, towards the close of E. N. 23, A. J. P. 3989, B. C. 725. Consequently, the embassy took place in the twenty-second year of his reign, or in the eighth year after the miraculous destruction of Sennacherib's army and Hezekiah's illness.

It may possibly be objected that the Scripture phrase "at that time" shows that the embassy must have been nearer to the time of his illness, and that the reasons assigned for the embassy prove this. Merodach Baladan "had heard that Hezekiah had been sick" (2 Kings, xx. 12, Isai. xxxix. 1); and the ambassadors were sent "to inquire of the wonder that was done in the land" (2 Chron. xxxii. 31). This must have been the going back of the shadow on the sun-dial of Ahaz. The astronomical observations of the Chaldæans would lead

them to notice that phenomenon ; and the inquiry would be made soon after the wonder happened.

But these reasons are more specious than solid. The phrase "at that time," is often used indefinitely ; and the reasons assigned were the pretext, the ostensible motive only. The real object was to enter into a league offensive and defensive against Sennacherib. The sickness of Hezekiah may or may not have been heard of early at Babylon. The fact of the destruction of Sennacherib's army was no doubt known there soon after it happened ; but the narrative of Herodotus shows that it was attributed to natural causes, and connected more with the power of the Egyptians than of the Jews. (Herod. B. II., 5. 141.) The celestial phenomenon would doubtless be noted at the time of its occurrence ; but so far as the Chaldæans could perceive, it had no necessary connection with any event in Jewish history, and some time must have elapsed before they could learn anything of a miraculous sign. The fact that Sennacherib had never again ventured to invade Judæa, and the great prosperity of Hezekiah after his illness, would all tend to impress the king of Babylon more strongly in the twenty-second year than in the years immediately following his recovery, with a sense of the importance of an alliance with the Jewish monarch. We must also reject all the authority of profane history, unless we yield to the settled conclusion that the embassy of Merodach Baladan was in the twenty-second year of Hezekiah.

The Scriptures say nothing concerning the length of the reign either of Sennacherib or of Esar Haddon. Polyhistor speaks of the latter under the name of Asordan, Asordanus, or Asordanius, and asserts that his father appointed him to be king of Babylon while he himself retired again into Assyria, that is to Nineveh, which was its capital. In this narrative Polyhistor evidently passes over in silence the kings of Babylon named by Ptolemy after Belibus until the second interregnum. The reason of this it would be in vain to conjecture. They may have been the viceroys of Sennacherib ; or considering Babylon as an appanage of the

empire, they may have been younger branches of the blood royal. That Sennacherib was obliged to interfere the second time on account of the turbulent spirit existing in Babylon, and that he then placed his youngest son Esar Haddon on the throne of that dominion, appears to me the only hypothesis by which we can explain the apparently conflicting testimony of Polyhistor and Ptolemy. It is certain from the Scriptures, that on the assassination of Sennacherib by his sons Adram-melech and Sharezer in the temple of his God Nisroch in Nineveh, Esar Haddon succeeded to the throne of Assyria. Eusebius states that Esar Haddon reigned as the successor of his father eight years. The Canon of Ptolemy assigns to Assar Addin as king of Babylon a reign of thirteen years. From this I am led to infer that during his father's life-time he was king of Babylon five years, and after his father's death, the monarch of Assyria and Babylon united for eight years. If this be so, we are at once furnished with a clue to guide us through the labyrinth of Assyrian chronology. Assar Addin reigned as king of Babylon from the 68th to the 80th year inclusive of the Era of Nabonassar; that is, according to our synchronized table, from Feb. 9th, A. J. P. 4034, B. C. 680, to Feb. 5th, A. J. P., 4047, B. C. 667; for on the 6th of Feb., A. J. P. 4067, the 81st year of Nab. began. The last eight years of this period extend from Feb. 8th, E. N. 73, A. J. P. 4039, B. C. 675. Consequently the last year of Sennacherib was E. N. 72, A. J. P. 4038, B. C. 676. This was the twentieth year of Manasseh. The tradition of the Jews is therefore very probable that in the twenty-second year of Manasseh, he was carried captive to Babylon by Esar Haddon; and Archbishop Usher's conjecture is also very probable, that in the same year the gleanings of the ten tribes were carried away by the same monarch called also Sargon and Sarchedon, Isai. xx. 1-3., Tobit i. 21, 2 Chron. xxxiii. 11, sixty-five years after Isaiah's prophecy, vii. 8. These events may therefore be placed in the same year, E. N. 74, A. J. P. 4040, B. C. 674. But these conjectural dates, the result of mere computation, can never be made the sure basis of any chronological system.

To return from this slight digression : The last mention made of Shalmaneser, king of Assyria, is in the sixth year of Hezekiah, and the ninth of Hoshea, when he destroyed the kingdom of Israel. The first mention of Sennacherib, his successor, is in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah, when he came up against all the fenced cities of Judah, 2 Kings, xviii. 10, 11. It follows, therefore, that Shalmaneser must have died, and Sennacherib have succeeded him, some time during the seven intervening years. In what precise year is uncertain. There is some confusion in the language of Polyhistor as it is represented in the Chronicon, and in the attempts of Eusebius to harmonize it with his conceptions of the meaning of the Bible. The words of Polyhistor are, "When he had lived eighteen years (in Empire) he departed this life." The expression "in Empire" [in Imperio] enclosed in brackets, I take to be inserted in the Latin translation from the Armenian, because the translator felt the absurdity of representing Sennacherib as living only eighteen years. Eusebius interprets the language of Polyhistor as meaning that Sennacherib reigned under Hezekiah eighteen years; and this I believe is the true meaning, for the fourteenth year of Hezekiah with the fifteen years during which his life was prolonged, make sixteen years. It is to be observed also, that the sum of the reigns of the three kings omitted by Polyhistor, together with the second interregnum before the reign of Esar Haddon, is nineteen years, ($6+1+4+8=19$); and if to these we add the five years of his reign at Babylon during his father's lifetime, we have twenty-four years after the subjugation of Belibus, or Elibus, by Sennacherib, which must have been in E. N. 48, A. J. P. 4014, B. C. 700, or the twenty-fifth year of Hezekiah. I conclude, therefore, that Sennacherib reigned from E. N. 35, A. J. P. 4001, B. C. 713, to E. N. 72, A. J. P. 4038, B. C. 676; or from the twelfth year of Hezekiah to the twentieth of Manasseh inclusive, a period of thirty-eight years.

It was ingeniously conjectured by Sir Isaac Newton, and that conjecture has been subsequently adopted by the authors of the Universal History and by Dr. Hales,

that Tiglath Pilezer was the elder, and Nabonassar the younger son of Pul or Phul, the Belus of the Greeks. Pul, at his death, divided his kingdom between these two sons; so that Tiglath Pileser began to reign in Nineveh, and Nabonassar at Babylon, in the same year. If this be so, then the reigns of Tiglath Pileser and his son Shalmaneser occupied the first thirty-four years of the era of Nabonassar. Ahaz began to reign E. N. 7, and Pekah, the son of Remaliah, king of Israel, was slain E. N. 10. "Hoshea began to reign over Israel in the twelfth year of Ahaz, and against him came up Shalmaneser, king of Assyria; and Hoshea became his servant, and gave him presents." 2 Kings, xvii. 1-3. These few dates will enable us to arrive by approximation at the probable length of the earlier reigns. Tiglath Pileser invaded the north-eastern part of the ten tribes, and carried them into captivity in the days of Pekah (2 Kings, xv. 29); consequently not later than E. N. 10. Ahaz became tributary to Tiglath Pileser to secure himself from the attacks of Rezin, king of Syria, and Pekah, king of Israel; consequently after E. N. 7, and before E. N. 10. Shalmaneser came up against Hoshea in or after the first year of the latter, which was the twelfth of Ahaz; consequently not earlier than E. N. 19. We may therefore make the reign of Tiglath Pileser eighteen, and that of Shalmaneser sixteen years; for $18 + 16 = 34$. If, then, we assign twenty-five or thirty years to the reign of Pul, as he was contemporary with Menahem, we carry up the origin of the empire or kingdom of Assyria as high as we can with any probability go, that is, to A. J. P. 3942 or 3937, B. C. 772 or 777, during the first interregnum in Israel, coeval with the commencement of the Olympiads.

Having traced the Assyrian monarchy up to its origin, we must now return to the end of the reign of Esar Haddon, which, as we have seen, was the year E. N. 80, in order to determine the year in which Nineveh was destroyed. By that event the Assyrian monarchy was terminated, and the great Babylonian empire began, which formed the head of Daniel's prophetic image, and was the first of the four great empires described in his subsequent visions.

It appears from the history of Herodotus, that the Assyrian monarchy was first weakened by the inroads of the Medes. Without going into the intricacies of their chronology, which would be tedious and foreign from the present purpose, it is sufficient to observe that, according to that author, Dejoces, who was elected by them as their king, who collected the scattered tribes together, and may therefore be considered as the founder of their nation, reigned fifty-three years. His son, Phraortes, subdued the Persians, and then overran Asia. In the progress of his conquests he encountered the Assyrians, and proceeded to attack that part of them which inhabited Nineveh. This expression of Herodotus I understand as meaning that he did not attack the kingdom of Babylon, but was rather disposed to co-operate with that branch of the Assyrian empire against the parent state. Herodotus proceeds to observe of the Assyrians of Nineveh, that they were formerly the first power in Asia, but that, although they were still respectable, they were weakened by internal divisions. In an excursion against the Ninevites, Phraortes perished in the twenty-second year of his reign.

He was succeeded by his son Cyaxares, who carried military discipline to its greatest height. Having strengthened himself by a league, offensive and defensive, with the different nations of Asia beyond the Halys, he proceeded with all his forces against Nineveh, desiring to avenge the death of his father, and to make himself master of the Assyrian capital. He vanquished the Assyrians in a pitched battle; but while engaged in the siege of Nineveh, was surprised and overcome by the irruption of a northern horde of Scythians. These kept entire possession of the regions which they overran for twenty-eight years; but being at length weakened by intemperance, they were destroyed by stratagem, and at the expiration of that time Cyaxares recovered his power. The Medes then took Nineveh, and subdued all the Assyrians but those who inhabited the province of Babylon. Cyaxares died after reigning forty years, including the twenty-eight of the Scythian irruption, and was succeeded by his son, Astyages, the grandfather of

Cyrus the Persian. After a reign of thirty-five years, Astyages was deposed by his grandson, the Persians having, under his command, revolted from the Medes.—(Herodot. Clio, § 98–130).

Here then we have a period of 150 years from the election of Dejoces to the deposition of Astyages: $53 + 22 + 40 + 35 = 150$. We have now to see if we can synchronize any one of these years with dates already established. It is evident from the narrative of Herodotus, that the first siege of Nineveh by Cyaxares was in the early part of his reign; and that from the time of that siege is to be dated the Scythian period of twenty-eight years. It is also evident that the second siege and capture of Nineveh took place after the twenty-eight years were ended, and the Scythians expelled; and was therefore towards the close of the reign of Cyaxares.—(Herod. Lib. 1. § 106).

In a previous part of his first book, Herodotus speaks of an engagement between the Lydians in the time of their king, Alyattes, and the Medes under Cyaxares. The reign of Alyattes was long, being 57 years. His son Cræsus began to reign at the age of thirty-five; and, though older, was contemporary with Cyrus. His daughter Aryenis was given in marriage to Astyages, the son of Cyaxares, after the engagement between the Lydians and the Medes, as one of the terms of peace. After Cyrus had deposed his grandfather Astyages, the war commenced between the Lydians and the Persians; Cræsus having a desire to revenge on Cyrus the dethronement of his brother-in-law. He therefore crossed the Halys, which divided his dominions from those of the Medes, and advanced into Cappadocia. In this he was assisted by the philosopher Thales, the Milesian.* A drawn battle ensued; and Cræsus returned to Sardis, where he was afterwards taken captive by Cyrus in the

* Thales was born, according to Laertius, when Damasias was Archon of Athens; and his Archonship Dionysius of Halicarnassus places in the second year of the thirty-fifth Olympiad, corresponding with the last six months of A. J. P. 4075, and the first six months of A. J. P. 4076, B. C. 639–638. The eclipse occurred May 18, A. J. P. 4111, B. C. 603, when Thales was 35 years old.

fourteenth year of his reign ; or (35 + 14) in the forty-ninth year of his age.—(Clio, § 25–86).

The engagement in the time of Cyaxares, to which reference is here made, was occasioned, according to the same historian, by the protection which Alyattes gave to some of the Scythians who had fled from the vengeance of their Median conqueror. As Alyattes refused to give them up, a war ensued for five years ; and “in the sixth year,” says Herodotus, “in the midst of an engagement, the day suddenly became night.” This total eclipse had been foretold to the Ionians, by Thales the Milesian. The fear which it occasioned led to a peace ; and that peace was confirmed by the marriage of Astyages and Aryenis.—(Herod. Clio, § 74).

Chronologers are divided in sentiment concerning the date of this memorable eclipse. The unerring science of astronomy narrows the field of controversy to 22 years ; but within that boundary the following eclipses have severally been considered as the supposed eclipse of Thales :—

1. According to Calvisius—B. c. 607. July 30. Afternoon, 1 h. 55'. Dig. Ec. 8.
2. According to Bayer, Mayer, Costard, }
Stukely, Lalande, Pingré, Montucla, } B. c. 603. May 18. Morn-
Kennedy, Playfair, Hales - - - } ing, 9 h. 30' Total.
3. According to Archbishop Usher—B. c. 601. Sept. 19. Morning, 10 h. 57'. Dig. Ec. 9.
4. According to Petavius, Marsham, }
Hardouin, Bouhier, Larcher - - - } B. c. 597. July 9. Aftern.
3 h. Dig. Ec. 10° 33'.
5. According to Pliny, Scaliger, Strau- }
chius, Riccioli, Newton, Ferguson, } B. c. 585. May 28. Aftern.
Vignoles, Jackson - - - - - } 3 h. Dig. Ec. 11° 20'

Of these five eclipses it will be seen that the only *total* eclipse was B. c. 603 ; and the only eclipses approaching near to total, were B. c. 597 and 585. Now, according to Dr. Hales : “1. The only discriminating circumstance of this eclipse, recorded by *Herodotus*, and which he afterwards repeats, § 103, namely, that ‘*the day suddenly became night*,’ intimates that it was total. Consequently, four of the eclipses, B. c. 607, 601, 597, 585, are excluded, because they were all partial, more or less ; and only the eclipse of B. c. 603 is left ; which, according to the accurate calculation of *Mayer*, in his *Mémoire*, entitled

Chronologia Scythica, of the *Petersburgh Transactions*, A. D. 1728, proved to be total *et cum mora*; the moon being then in perigee, and the sun in apogee. And his calculation was afterwards verified by two English astronomers, *Costard* and *Stukely*, respecting the quantity of the eclipse, and the track of the moon's shadow on the earth's disk, in the *Philosophical Transactions*, A. D. 1754.

"According to their joint calculations, the moon's shadow in the eclipse of B. C. 603, entered upon the earth's disk about 23 degrees of longitude, reckoned from the Isle of *Ferro*, and one degree north of the Equator. It traversed the mouths of the *Nile*, crossed the *Mediterranean*, passed through *Cilicia* and *Cappadocia*, as far as *Trebisonde*, under a breadth of forty-six German miles; and therefore traversed the field of battle, which probably was near the mouth of the river *Halys*, about half after nine in the morning; at which time of the day it was likely that the engagement had commenced.

"2. The other eclipses are also excluded on account of their tracks. For that of B. C. 585, followed the course of the *Mediterranean* Sea, and did not touch *Cappadocia*; that of B. C. 597, traversed *Scythia* and the *Palus Mæotis*, north of the *Caspian* Sea; that of B. C. 601, passed considerably to the north of the *Euxine* Sea; and that of B. C. 607, traversed the earth's disk, in the vicinity and direction of the Equator. Consequently, none of these eclipses, even supposing they had been total, could have been the eclipses coarsely predicted by *Thales*, who noticed only the year, but not the day or hour of the eclipse."—*Montucla*, *Hist. des Mathématiques*, Tom. 2, p. 101, 713. Ed. 2, quoted by *Dr. Hales*, *Analysis*, Tom. 1, p. 77, 78. Ed. 2. 1830.

By the table, the Canon of *Ptolemy* and the calculations already made, the reader has seen that the first year of *Nebuchadnezzar* began with E. N. 144, A. J. P. 4110, B. C. 604. Consequently the battle took place in the second year of *Nebuchadnezzar*, E. N. 145, A. J. P. 4111, B. C. 603. That year began Jan. 21, and the battle was on the 18th of the following May. It was in

the sixth year of the war. Five solid years had elapsed at the least calculation since the Scythians had been conquered by Cyaxares. Making allowance of some little time between the conquest and almost entire extermination of the Scythians, and the protection of the few fugitives by Alyattes at Sardis which began the war, it will not be deemed extravagant, if we consider the year of the battle as the seventh or eighth after the general expulsion of the Scythians. We may therefore place that event in the year B. c. 609 or 610. Now Herodotus tells us that it was after the Medes had thus recovered their ancient importance, that they took Nineveh, (Clio, § 106.) Consequently, it was after B. c. 609, and before the battle with the Lydians, May 18th, B. c. 603; and thus it is undeniably proved, that it was after the seventeenth year of Nabopolassar, the father of Nebuchadnezzar, and during the last four years of the reign of that prince, that Nineveh, and the Assyrian Empire, was destroyed.

Let the reader now revert to the extract from Alexander Polyhistor, and he will see confirmation strong of these deductions. The Sardanapallus of Polyhistor, who reigned 21 years, and was the father of Nabucodrossor, was evidently the Nabopolassar of Ptolemy. He sent an army to the aid of Astyages the Mede, the prince and satrap of the Median nation. Cyaxares, it is true, was still the king of the Medes; but it was towards the close of his long reign of forty years; and his son Astyages, soon to be his successor, may well have had a daughter by one of his wives, old enough to be the bride of a prince so young as Nebuchadnezzar then was. The object of sending this army to aid the Medes, appears by the following extract from the history of Abydenus preserved in the Armenian Chronicon of Eusebius. I give it in the English translation by Cory, from the Latin of the Armenian editor. "After him [i. e. Axerdis, as Mr. Cory thinks, and as appears to me most probable] Saracus reigned over the Assyrians, and when he was informed that a very great multitude of barbarians had come up from the sea to attack him, he sent Busalossorus as his general in haste

to Babylon. But he, having with a treasonable design obtained Amuhean, the daughter of Astyages the prince of the Medes, to be affianced to his son Nabuchodrossorus, marched straightways to surprise the city of Ninus, that is Nineveh. But when Saracus the king was apprised of all these proceedings, he burnt the royal palace. And Nabuchodrossorus succeeded to the Empire, and surrounded Babylon with a strong wall."—Euseb. Chron., Ed. Venice, Tom. 1, p. 54; Cory's Ancient Fragments, p. 64.

These extracts from Chaldæan history enable us to see the accuracy of Herodotus, and also account for the distinction he makes when he says that the Medes subdued the Assyrians excepting those who dwelt in Babylon.

We have brought down the reigns of the Assyrian monarchs to the close of the reign of Esar Haddon, which terminated, as we have seen, with the year E. N. 80. Leaving there the line of successive reigns, we have proceeded to ascertain as nearly as we could by circumstantial evidence, the date of the destruction of Nineveh. We have thus brought it within the last four years of Nabopolassar in Ptolemy's Canon, that is, within the years E. N. 140, 141, 142 and 143. The remaining period therefore of the Assyrian Empire would be at the shortest (140—80) 60, or at the longest (143—80) 63 years. We find this space occupied in the Canon by three reigns at Babylon, Saosducheus, Chyniladanus and Nabopollassar. In the observations of Eusebius upon the extract from Alexander Polyhistor (p. 131) we also find three reigns at Nineveh; Sammuges or Sammughes; his brother, whom Eusebius does not name; and lastly, Nabupalsar. There is a great diversity among historians in the name of the last king. Some call him Sardanapalus; a name given by others to Nabopolassar. Abydenus calls him Saracus. These conflicting accounts may, I think, be reconciled in the following manner. After the death of Esar Haddon, Sammuges or Sammughes reigned 21 years. During the first 20 of these years Saosducheus reigned at Babylon as his viceroy; and on his death Sammughes appointed Chyniladanus to succeed him. A year after Sammughes

died, and was succeeded at Nineveh by his brother, who may have been the Axerdis of Abydenus. He reigned 21 years and was succeeded by Saracus. Chyniladanus dying in the same year with Axerdis, Saracus appointed one of his generals called by Abydenus Busallossorus, and by Ptolemy Nabopollassar, to be his viceroy in Babylon. Saracus being an effeminate and weak prince addicted to his pleasures, Nabopolassar acquired over him that ascendancy which the mayors of the palace obtained at the close of the Merovingian dynasty in France. Hence while Saracus was the nominal, he was the real sovereign of Assyria; and as he is evidently the Sardanapallus of Polyhistor, the names of Saracus and Sardanapallus were confounded. All historians agree that the last Assyrian monarch destroyed himself and his treasures; but they have confounded the names. The ambitious Nabopollassar or Sardanapallus, despising his master, determined to unite with the Medes in destroying Nineveh, that he might found a new empire of which Babylon was to be the sole capital. In this manner all the accounts are easily reconciled, and the whole chronology from the beginning to the end of the Assyrian Kingdom may be adjusted.

The length, and consequently the commencement of the reign of Pul, the earliest monarch of whom we have any certain accounts, is doubtful. Sir Isaac Newton carries his reign as high as the year B. C. 790. He supposes that the king of Nineveh to whom Jonah was sent (about B. C. 800) was Pul's father. But of course this is all conjecture; we have no certain proof earlier than the time of Menahem, B. C. 769; and as Sir Isaac Newton placed the death of Pul in the year before the era of Nabonassar began, B. C. 748, or before Feb. 26, B. C. 747, the only question is which is most probable, that he reigned 30 years from B. C. 777, or 43 years from B. C. 790? Without attempting to decide what cannot be known, the succession of Assyrian kings from the time of Pul, and the consequent probable duration of the Assyrian Monarchy, may be thus stated.

Nineveh.		E. N.	A. J. P.	B. C.	Babylon.		Y.	E. N.	A. J. P.	B. C.
1	Pul or Phul	30	9337	777						
2	Tiglath Pileser	18	3967	747	1	Nabonassar	14	1	3967	747
3	Shalman-eser	16	3985	729	2	Nadius	2	15	3981	733
4	Sennacherib	38	4001	713	3	Chinzirus and Porus	5	17	3983	731
					4	Jugæus	5	22	3988	726
					5	Mardoc Empadus	12	27	3993	721
					6	Arkianus	5	39	4005	709
						I. Interregnum	2	44	4000	704
						Merodach Baladan, 6 m.				
					7	Belibus or Elibus	3	46	4012	702
					8	Apronadius	6	49	4015	699
					9	Rigebelus	1	55	4021	693
					10	Mesessimordacus	4	56	4022	692
						II. Interregnum	8	60	4026	688
5	Esar Haddon	8	4039	675	11	Esar Haddon	13	68	4034	680
6	Sammughes	21	4047	667	12	Saosducheus	20	81	4047	667
7	Axerdis	21	4068	646	13	Chyniladanus	22	101	4067	647
8	Saracus	20	4089	625	14	Nabopollassarus or Sardanapallus, as Viceroy of Saracus.	20	123	4089	625
In the 20th year of his reign, Nineveh is taken by the united forces of the Babylonians and Medes, and thus an end is put to the Assyrian Monarchy, after it had continued at least 172, or according to Sir Isaac Newton, 185 years		172	4108	606	So that the Babylonian Kingdom remained as an appanage of the Assyrian Empire, at least 142 years After the destruction of Nineveh, Nabopollassar reigned one year and died		142	142	4108	606
							143	4109	605	605

Thus it appears that Nineveh was destroyed B. C. 606. This is the date assigned to that event by Dr. Hales. He assumes the computation of Sir Isaac Newton as to the commencement of Pul's reign and that of Tiglath Pileser; but he makes the reign of Shalmaneser commence B. C. 726, and that of Sennacherib B. C. 714. Having written before the first part of the *Chronicon* of Eusebius was discovered, he embraced the erroneous supposition that Merodach Baladan was the same person as Mardok Empod. This error led to many others, among which may be mentioned the unwarrantable hypothesis that there were two Esar Haddons, the one of Assyria, the other of Babylon.

THE BABYLONIAN EMPIRE.

This began from the destruction of Nineveh. Nabopolassar appears to have immediately associated his son Nebuchadnezzar with himself in the empire. This may have been one of the terms of the contract by which the Median princess, the daughter of Astyages, was given to his son in marriage. Hence Abydenus speaks only of Nabuchodrossorus as succeeding to the empire; and the prophet Daniel, explaining the vision of the image, takes no notice of the father, but says to the king, "Thou art this head of gold," Dan. ii. 38. Certain it is, from Berosus, that Nebuchadnezzar was sent at the head of the army to effect the conquest of Syria, Phœnicia, Egypt, and the neighboring countries, in the first year of the destruction of Nineveh, and in his father's lifetime. We must, therefore, add one year to the forty-three which he reigned after his father's death, as mentioned by Ptolemy. In other words, we must count the year of Nebuchadnezzar's death as the forty-fourth of the Babylonian empire.

Nebuchadnezzar was succeeded by his son Evil-Merodach, Jerem. lii. 31; 2 Kings, xxv. 27. That prince, in the first year of his reign, released Jehoiachin, king of Judah, from prison, in the thirty-seventh year of his captivity. Jehoiachin reigned at Jerusalem three months and ten days, and was then taken captive to Babylon, in the eighth year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign, E. N. 151, A.

J. P. 4117, B. C. 597. That was the first year of his captivity, and consequently the thirty-seventh year was E. N. 187, A. J. P. 415, B. C. 561. On consulting the Canon of Ptolemy, it will be seen that precisely in the year E. N. 187, Illuarodamus began to reign. This proves that the Evil-Merodach of the Scriptures is the same person as the Illuarodamus, Amil-marudoch, Evil-maluruchus, &c., of the profane historians. Berosus and Ptolemy agree that he reigned only two years, and not twelve, as incorrectly stated in the Armenian extract from Polyhistor.

All the historians agree that the husband of his sister, Neriglisar, the Nericassolassar of Ptolemy, left a son named Laborosoarchod, who was put to death after a reign of nine months. As he did not reign a whole year, Ptolemy, according to his custom, passes him over in silence, and speaks only of Nabonadius, one of the conspirators elected by the rest as his successor. This being the last king of the Chaldean dynasty, must have been the Belshazzar of Daniel. I say *must have been*, notwithstanding the various conjectures caused by the contradictory accounts of Daniel, Polyhistor and Berosus. Daniel says expressly, "In that night was Belshazzar slain, and Darius the Mede took the kingdom." Dan. v. 30, 31. To what king do the circumstances of the case permit these words to be applied? Not to Evil-merodach; for that is his Scripture name, and there is no evidence of his having another; not to Neriglisar, for he appears to have died a natural death; not to his son, Laborasoarchod, for he was but a boy, and the circumstances of the feast could not, with any probability, apply to him. Nabonadius only remains; but to him it is, in the first place, objected, that he was one of the conspirators who slew Laborosoarchod, and was not of the blood royal; whereas, in Daniel, Belshazzar is spoken of as a descendant of Nebuchadnezzar, Dan. v. 2, 11, 13, 18, 22. To this it may be replied, that Nabonadius may have been a son or near relative of Evil-merodach, and so a lineal descendant from Nebuchadnezzar, which Neriglisar and his son, Laborosoarchod, certainly were not. It is objected, secondly, that Nabonadius surrendered himself to Cyrus, and was not only kept alive, but was made governor of Caramania for the rest of his life.

But to this it may be answered, that Daniel was a contemporary writer and an eye-witness; whereas Berosus and Polyhistor lived several centuries after the event, and on a subject affecting their national vanity may have been deceived by false reports. It is objected, thirdly, that Darius the Median took the kingdom, according to Daniel, and not Cyrus, and hence it is argued that the events could not have been the same. But, if Cyrus was the general, commanding the united forces of the Medes and Persians, and Darius the Mede was no other than Cyaxares II., the uncle and father-in-law of Cyrus, it was perfectly proper to say that Darius the Median took the kingdom, because it was taken in his name; and equally proper to say that Cyrus took the kingdom, because he was the general commanding. That Darius the Median was Cyaxares II., the son of Astyages, and brother of Mandane, the mother of Cyrus, is admitted by Dr. Hales. But that eminent chronologer appears to me to indulge too boldly in conjecture, when he makes Belshazzar the son and successor of Evil-merodach, and Nabonadius a Babylonian nobleman, the viceroy of Darius the Mede, B. c. 553, besieged in Borsippa, the citadel of Babylon, B. c. 538, and finally taken by Cyrus, B. c. 536!

I prefer to follow more simply the testimony of the Scriptures, and that of the Canon of Ptolemy, which we have found to be so accurate. According to these authorities, therefore, I thus arrange the dates of the Babylonian empire, from the destruction of Nineveh to the death of Belshazzar, and the conquest of Babylon by the Medes and Persians.

Destruction of Nineveh and the Assyrian Empire, E. N. 142,

A. J. P. 4108, B. C. 606.

	Years.	E. N.	A. J. P.	B. C.
Associate reign of Nabopolassar and his son Nebuchadnezzar,	1	143	4109	605
Sole reign of Nebuchadnezzar,	43	144	4110	604
Evil-Merodach, or Iluarodamus,	2	187	4153	561
Neriglisar, or Niricassolassar,	4	189	4155	559
Laborosoarchod, his son, 9 m., not counted.				
Nabonadius, or Belshazzar,	17	193	4159	555
Babylon taken by the Medes and Persians,				
when the Empire had lasted 67 years;	67			
or, 142 + 67 = 209 years from Nabonassar.				

IV. THE MEDO-PERSIAN CHRONOLOGY TO THE SUBVERSION OF THAT EMPIRE.

It has been already remarked that to enter into all the intricacies arising from the confusion of names and dates among the ancient Greek historians, would be equally tedious and unnecessary. The general accuracy of Herodotus is so well established, that I shall confine myself to his account of the rise of the Medes. In considering the chronology of the Assyrians, we have already established the fact by means of the eclipse of Thales, that the general expulsion of the Scythians took place in the year E. N. 138 or 139, A. J. P. 4104 or 4105, B. C. 610 or 609. Counting back 28 years, the duration of the Scythian dominion, according to Herodotus, we arrive at B. C. 637 or 638, as the time of the first siege of Nineveh by the Medes, early in the reign of Cyaxares. Consequently, we may, with Dr. Hales, place the death of Phraortes in the twenty-second year of his reign, in E. N. 107, A. J. P. 4073, B. C. 641; and the first year of his reign, E. N. 86, A. J. P. 4052, B. C. 662. Dejoces, therefore, founded the kingdom of the Medes, E. N. 33, A. J. P. 3999, B. C. 715, in the tenth year of Hezekiah, and consequently about four or five years after the destruction of the kingdom of Israel by Shalmaneser.

The chronology of the Medes may therefore be thus arranged —

No.	Y.	E. N.	A. J. P.	B. C.
1 Dejoces	53	33 — 85	3999 — 4051	715 — 663
2 Phraortes	22	86 — 107	4052 — 4073	662 — 641
3 Cyaxares I.	40	108 — 147	4074 — 4113	640 — 601
4 Astyages	35	148 — 182	4114 — 4148	600 — 566

Before proceeding to the Persian chronology, I think it necessary to lay before the reader the Canon of Ptolemy concerning the reign of the Persian kings at Babylon. This, it will be observed, completes the period of 424 Egyptian years which he calls the Era of Nabonassar. After the year in which Alexander died, he begins a new computation named from Philip Aridæus, the half brother of Alexander, which will come under

consideration in treating of the Macedonian Empire, the third of Daniel's great monarchies.

No	Kings of the Persians.	No. of years of each King.	The whole number of years collected at the end of each.
1	Cyrus	9	209 } 218 9 }
2	Cambyses	8	226
3	Darius I.	36	262
4	Xerxes	21	283
5	Artaxerxes I.	41	324
6	Darius II.	19	343
7	Artaxerxes II.	46	389
8	Ochus	21	410
9	Arogus	2	412
10	Darius III.	4	416
11	Alexander the Macedonian	8	424
		215	209 } 424 215 }
			424

Petavius has justly observed that "The early years of Cyrus are the cardinal point and foundation on which depend the arrangement of preceding and succeeding times, and the concord of sacred and profane history. Wherefore we must with all labor and diligence search out the beginning of Cyrus and the Persian reign," *De Doct. Temp.*, Lib. x. c. 14. By the preceding table it will be seen that the reign of Cyrus, on the computation of which so much depends, is to be divided into two periods: the first preceding the capture of Babylon; the second following that great event.

The original sources of information respecting Cyrus are, 1. The Persian historians. 2. The Greek writers of profane history, Herodotus, Xenophon, Ctesias, and the abridgment of Trogus Pompeius by Justin. 3. The Computations of the Fathers and Ecclesiastical historians. The Persian historians pay little or no regard to chronology; and are useful only in correcting oriental names which are sadly disfigured by the Greeks,—in corroborating the leading facts of history,—and especially in forming the connecting link, by means of

which we can trace the affinities of sacred and profane authorities, even where they seem widest apart, and the most at variance. To illustrate this last remark we may observe that the prefix *κυ*, Cy, of the Greeks corresponds with the *Kai* of the Persians, which, it is said, means a king or prince. Remove this prefix, for example, from *Cyaxares*, and the remainder of the word may be more easily made to accord with oriental names.

Of the Greek historians, Herodotus says that *Cyrus* reigned 29 years. *Xenophon* does not mention the entire length of his reign, but says only that he reigned at *Babylon* seven years. *Ctesias* affirms, and so does *Justin*, that he reigned 30 years. Of the Fathers and Ecclesiastical historians, *Theophilus*, the earliest extant who has attempted to settle chronological questions, gives him 38 years (*Ad Autolyicum*, Lib. iii.); but as this author states that he died in the 62d Olympiad, this must have been an error in his text, as will soon be made to appear. *Clemens Alexandrinus* (*Strom.*, Lib. i.) and *Eusebius* say 30 years; and *Sulpitius Severus*, 31. We may take 30 as the mean; and that number is given by *Cicero*, who says (*De Divinat.*, Lib. i. s. 23) that he lived till his seventieth year, and began to reign when he was 40 years of age. The date of his death is determined by three eclipses recorded by *Ptolemy*, all of which, as *Petavius* has fully shown, accord exactly with modern computations. I shall mention the first only, which was of the moon, and, according to *Ptolemy*, took place in the seventh year of *Cambyzes*, E. N. 225, on the 17th day of *Phamenoth*. According to modern computation, it took place in the night between Wednesday and Thursday, July 16 and 17, A. J. P. 4191, B. C. 523, at the beginning of the second year of the sixty-fourth Olympiad. The year E. N. 225 began, as the reader will see by the table, Jan. 1st, A. J. P. 4191, B. C. 523. This was the seventh year of *Cambyzes*. Consequently the first year of *Cambyzes* was E. N. 219, and the last year of *Cyrus* E. N. 218, which began Jan. 3, A. J. P. 4184, B. C. 530. The first new moon after the summer solstice in that year, began the third year of the sixty-second Olympiad, in which *Theophilus* says that *Cyrus* died. Counting back 70 years we come to E. N. 149, which began Jan.

20, A. J. P. 4115, B. C. 599, as the year of the birth of Cyrus; and then counting forward to his fortieth year, in which Cicero says he began to reign in Persia, on the death of his father Cambyses, we find that it was E. N. 188, which began Jan. 10, A. J. P. 4154, B. C. 560. Now this is corroborated by the following extract from the third book of the chronography of Africanus, which is preserved by Eusebius (Præp. Evangel., Lib. x. c. 10) where he says: "The celebrated transportation of the Hebrews, carried into captivity by Nabuchodonosor, king of Babylon, continued for 70 years as Jeremiah predicted, and as Berossus, the Babylonian, relates of Nabuchodonosor. But after the 70 years captivity, Cyrus began to reign over the Persians in the fifty-fifth Olympiad; as may be found from the Bibliotheca of Diodorus, and the histories of Thallus and Castor, and also from Polybius and Phlegon, and others who have attended to the Olympiads; FOR ALL ARE AGREED AS TO THE DATE. Cyrus, therefore, *in the first year of his reign, which was the first year of the fifty-fifth Olympiad, &c., &c.*, P. Ev., Ed. Colon. 1688, p. 488. Africanus committed the gross mistake of confounding the first year of the reign of Cyrus in Persia, with the first year of his reign at Babylon. The first year of the fifty-fifth Olympiad began at the first new moon after the summer solstice A. J. P. 4154, B. C. 560, and continued till the same season in the following year. Thus, with almost mathematical certainty, do we establish the beginning of the reign of Cyrus as king of Persia in the last half of B. C. 560, or the first half of A. J. P. 4155, B. C. 559. If we assume this last date, we make the reign of Cyrus thirty years exactly to the end of E. N. 218, A. J. P. 4184, B. C. 530, which corresponded with the first half of the third year of the sixty-second Olympiad. We have seen from Herodotus that Astyages was dethroned by Cyrus at the end of E. N. 182, A. J. P. 4148, B. C. 566. It was, therefore, while he was prince of Persia, in his father's lifetime, and full six years before his accession to the throne. It matters not whether Astyages was dethroned by Cyrus, as Herodotus asserts; or whether he abdicated the throne voluntarily, as Dr. Hales will have it.

All the historians agree as to the fact ; and the Persian historians relate that he was succeeded, not by Cyrus, but by his own son, the uncle of Cyrus, whom they call Fraiborz, and who is called, by Daniel, Darius the Median, or, as it is in Hebrew, Dariyavesh. Sir John Malcolm says, somewhere in his history of Persia, that *Dara* signifies a prince ; and Daniel evidently associates him with Cyrus. So this Daniel prospered in the reign of Darius, and in the reign of Cyrus the Persian. Whether he acted at Babylon as the associate or as the deputy of Cyrus is a matter of no consequence. As he was the uncle and father-in-law of Cyrus, it is more probable that in the attack upon Babylon, Cyrus, commanding the united forces of the Medes and Persians, acted for his uncle ; but as he was the more conspicuous of the two, and so shortly became the sole sovereign of the Medo-Persian Empire, it was natural for Ptolemy not to mention Darius but to speak of Cyrus alone. In this way do we reconcile the account of Xenophon, who says that Cyrus reigned at Babylon only seven years, with the Canon of Ptolemy, which says that he reigned nine years. Darius, or Fraiborz, or Cyaxares II., by all which names he is known, was 62 years old when Babylon was taken (Dan. v. 31) at the close of E. N. 209, A. J. P. 4175, B. C. 539. Counting back 62 solid years, we find that he was born E. N. 148, A. J. P. 4114, B. C. 600, the very year in which his father, Astyages, ascended the throne of Media and Persia. Consequently he was thirty-five years old when by the abdication of his father he began to reign at Ecbatana. He reigned over Media 27 years, and then with Cyrus as his associate for two years at Babylon, till his death ; so that he reigned in the whole 29 years, and died at the end of E. N. 211, A. J. P. 4177, B. C. 537, when he was 64 years old. With him ended the kingdom of the Medes after it had continued from the first year of Dejoces, 179 years, ($53+22+40+35+29=179$.)

Cyrus, by the death of his father, began to reign in Persia when he was 40 years old, and continued from E. N. 188 to 209, or 21 years. He then became associated with his uncle for two years at Babylon, and after his death continued seven years longer, and then died.

As to the manner in which he died, Herodotus and Xenophon are completely at issue. Which of them is right affects not our argument. From the reign of Cyrus in Persia, B. C. 550, to the year E. N. 417, A. J. P. 4352, B. C. 332, when Alexander the Great began to reign, is exactly 228 years. This accords with Agathias, "A Greek historian of high character, who," according to Dr. Hales, "consulted the Persian Records, and who states, that, from the first year of the reign of Cyrus, the ancient Persian Empire subsisted 228 years." Analysis, vol. 4, p. 89, note. We are now prepared to give a synchronized view of the second of Daniel's four kingdoms, which began at the termination of the first by the capture of Babylon.

MEDO-PERSIAN EMPIRE.

No	Greek Names.	Persian Names.	Year of each reign.	E. N.	A. J. P.	B. C.
1	Crochares II. and Cyrus	Frathor & Kai Chastu	2	210-211	4176-4177	538-537
2	Cambyses, 7 v 5 m. } Succeeded the Median, 7 m. }	Kai Choosru	7	212-218	4178-4184	536-530
3	Darius Hystaspes	Lothorasp	8	219-222	4185-4192	529-522
4	Xerxes	Gushasp	36	227-263	4193-4227	521-487
5	Artaxerxes Longimanus	Artashir D'ragdest, (called also Bahaman)	21	233-254	4228-4248	486-466
6	Darius Nothus		41	264-324	4249-4309	465-425
7	Artaxerxes Mnemon		19	325-344	4310-4329	424-406
8	Ochus	Durab I.	46	344-390	4330-4375	405-360
9	Artaxerxes or Arsaces		21	390-410	4375-4395	360-339
10	Darius Codrmanus	Durab II.	2	411-413	4396-4398	338-337
			4	413-417	4398-4402	336-333
			207			

*171

It must here be observed that Ptolemy, in his Canon, includes Alexander among the Persian kings; but this was done only on account of his ending the period of time which he calls the Era of Nabonassar with the death of the Grecian conqueror. As he computes the reigns from the first of Thoth in each year, regardless of the precise month or day in which the several kings began or ended their reign, the last of the four years of Darius Codomannus is counted from the 14th of November, B. c. 333, to the 13th of November inclusive of the year B. c. 332. But the decisive battle of Arbela took place Oct. 1, B. c. 331, towards the close of that year which Ptolemy counts as the first of Alexander, and which ended Nov. 13, B. c. 331. This is known with absolute certainty; because, according to Plutarch, there was a total eclipse of the moon eleven days before that battle. It is found by computation that in the meridian of Arbela, the moon was eclipsed more than $14\frac{1}{2}$ digits in the night between Monday and Tuesday, September 20th, A. J. P. 4383, B. c. 331, one month and twenty-four days before the termination of E. N. 417. Consequently the battle was fought on the first of October of that year. Darius was killed not long after; and this will account for the computation of Eusebius followed by Petavius, that the unhappy monarch reigned six years, and not four, as in the Canon of Ptolemy.

But though the death of Darius took place towards the close of that year which Ptolemy calls the first of Alexander's reign, there is another difficulty of still greater magnitude concerning the last year of Alexander. "It is agreed by all," says Josephus, "that Alexander died in the hundred and fourteenth Olympiad." (Cons. Apion. Lib. i. § 22.) Eusebius, in his list of Olympiads, says the same thing. (Eus. Chron. Arm. Ed. Ven. Tom. i. p. 297.) But the first year of the 114th Olym. began at the summer solstice, A. J. P. 4390, B. c. 324; and the year E. N. 425 began on the twelfth of November of that year. Alexander, then, must have died between the summer solstice and the eleventh of November, A. J. P. 4390, B. c. 324, if he died in the year E. N. 424, and also in the 114th Olympiad. Whereas Plutarch quotes his own diary to show that his last sickness began on the eighteenth of the month Dæsius, and

that he died on the twenty-eighth in the evening, corresponding with the 22d or 23d of May. We are reduced, therefore, to this dilemma: if he died in the year E. N. 424, it must have been at least a month *preceding* the 114th Olympiad. If he died in the first year of the 114th Olympiad, it must have been in May, A. J. P. 4391, B. C. 323, in the year E. N. 425, reckoned by Ptolemy as the first year of Philip Aridæus. With these remarks I proceed to the second part of Ptolemy's Canon, entitled

The years of the kings who reigned after the death of the king Alexander.

Philip who reigned after Alexander the Founder	7	7
Alexander Aegus	12	19

Kings of the Greeks in Egypt.

1	Ptolemy Lagus	20	39
2	Ptolemy Philadelphus	38	77
3	Ptolemy Energetes I.	25	102
4	Ptolemy Philopator	17	119
5	Ptolemy Epiphanes	24	143
6	Ptolemy Philometor	35	178
7	Ptolemy Energetes II.	29	207
8	Ptolemy Soter	36	243
9	Dionysius	29	272
10	Cleopatra	22	294

Kings of the Romans.

Augustus	43	337
Tiberius	22	359
Caius	4	363
Claudius	14	377
Nero	14	391
Vespasian	10	401
Titus	3	404
Domitian	15	419
Nerva	1	420
Trajan	19	439
Hadrian	21	460
Antoninus	23	483

We now come to our fifth general head, viz :

V. THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE FOUR KINGDOMS FORMED AFTER THE EXTINCTION OF THE FAMILY OF ALEXANDER THE GREAT.

I. THE KINGDOM OF MACEDON.

Eusebius has preserved in his *Chronicon* an extract from the philosopher Porphyry, giving an account of the Macedonian kingdom from the death of Alexander the Great until its subjugation by the Romans. It is too long for insertion here, and I must content myself with an abstract.

“Aridæus, the son of Philip and Philenna, the Thessalian, succeeded to the empire of Alexander, as we have said, in the second year of the one hundred and fourteenth Olympiad. His years are computed as eight; for he lived to the fourth year of the 115th Olympiad—Alexander had left two sons—Hercules, by Pharsina (Gr. Marsina), the daughter of Pharnabazus,—and Alexander, by Roxana, the daughter of Oxyartes, king of the Bactrians. Olympias, the mother of Alexander (the Great), slew Aridæus; and Cassander, the son of Antipater, slew her and the two sons of Alexander. One he himself killed; the other, the son of Marsina, he sent for that purpose to Polysperchon. The body of Olympias he cast out unburied, and declared himself king of the Macedonians. Having married Thessalonica, the daughter of Philip, he continued to reign 19 years, and then died of a painful disease. His reign, in which is reckoned the time after Aridæus in which Olympias held the government, is computed from the first year of the 116th to the third year of the 120th Olympiad. His sons Philip, and Alexander, and Antipater, succeeded him, and reigned three years and six months. Philip died in Elatia. Antipater having slain his mother, Thessalonica, fled to Lysimachus, by whom he was put to death. Alexander married Lysandra, the daughter of Ptolemy, and having made an alliance against his younger brother, Ptolemy, with Demetrius, the son of Antigonos, surnamed Poliorcetes, was murdered by him, and Demetrius himself enjoyed the sovereignty. The years in which the sons of Cassander reigned, are com-

puted from the fourth year of the 120th to the third of the 121st Olympiad. Demetrius having reigned six years, was expelled from his throne by Pyrrhus, king of Epirus—who reigned over the Macedonians seven months. In the eighth month, Lysimachus, the son of Agathocles, succeeded him, a Thessalian from Cranon, and one of the body-guard of Alexander. He was then reigning in Thrace and the Chersonesus, when he thus took possession of the bordering kingdom of Macedon. He reigned over Macedonia five years and six months, from the second year of the 123d Olympiad to the third of the 124th. He was at length conquered and killed by Seleucus Nicanor, king of Asia; but soon after the victory, Ptolemy, the son of Lagos, surnamed Ceraunus, slew Seleucus, and reigned over the Macedonians. He was slain when he had reigned one year and five months; so that the time of his reign is computed from the fourth year of the 124th Olympiad, to the fifth month of the first year of the 125th Olympiad. Ptolemy was succeeded by his brother Meleager, whom the Macedonians expelled after he had reigned two months. They then made Antipater king for 45 days. Sosthenes, one of the people, who expelled him, held the government two years, and then died. After this, there was an anarchy, so that from Ptolemy to the end of the anarchy, that is, from the fourth year of the 124th to the 126th Olympiad, we find that Ptolemy held the government one year and 5 months; Meleager, two months; Antipater, 45 days; Sosthenes, two years; and the rest of the time is considered as anarchy.

Antigonus the son of Demetrius Poliorcetes, called Gonatas, from Goni of Thessaly, where he was brought up, reigned, as all agree, 44 years; for he was king before he obtained Macedon full 10 years. He became king, therefore, in the second year of the 123d Olympiad, and king of Macedon in the first year of the 126th Olympiad. He conquered Greece, and lived in all 83 years, dying in the first year of the 135th Olympiad. His son Demetrius succeeded him, and becoming master of all Libya and Cyrene, and recovering all his father's former possessions, reduced them to one monarchy,

over which he ruled for ten years. He married one of his captives named Chryseis, by whom he had a son, who was the Philip that first carried on war with the Romans, and thus became the cause of many evils to the Macedonians. He provided for this son whom he left a minor, a guardian of the royal race named Antigonus Fuscus. The Macedonians perceiving the uprightness of Fuscus in his administration, caused him to marry Chryseis and become their king. This he did without prejudice to Philip, to whom at his death he left the crown. Antigonus Fuscus died after he had held the government 12 years, and had lived 42, in the fourth year of the 139th Olympiad. Philip began to reign alone from the 140th Olympiad, and reigned 42 full years. Perseus, the son of Philip, having by false accusations to his father procured the death of his brother Demetrius, reigned ten years and eight months; but in the fourth year of the 152d Olympiad, Lucius Emilius conquered him in an engagement with the Macedonians near Pydna. Perseus fled into Samothracia. He then voluntarily surrendered himself into the hands of his conquerors, and was carried by them to Alba, where he died in captivity at the end of five years. Thus under him was an end put to the independence of Macedon.

The Romans then, out of reverence for the glory and mighty sovereignty of the Macedonians, permitted them to live under their own laws. But in the nineteenth year, which corresponds with the third of the hundred and fifty-seventh Olympiad, one Andriscus, falsely calling himself a son of Perseus, and assuming the name of Philip, for which reason he is called the Pseudo-Philip, possessed himself of Macedonia by force, relying on the Thracians as his auxiliaries. He held it one year, and being then conquered in battle escaped into Thrace. By them he was delivered up, and was sent a prisoner to Rome. The Romans then made the Macedonians tributary because they had been so thankless as to abet the Pseudo-Philip, in the fourth year of the hundred and fifty-seventh Olympiad. Thus from Alexander the Great, or from the second year of the hundred and fourteenth Olympiad, to the fourth year of

the hundred and fifty-seventh Olympiad, in which the Macedonians became tributary to the Roman Empire, was in all 43 Olympiads and two years, making in the whole 174 years." Porph. ap. Euseb. Chron. Arm. Tom. 1, pp. 325-337.

Eusebius then proceeds to give a list of these reigns as a summary of Porphyry's evidence. This it is not necessary to insert here, as it will be included when we come to adjust these dates with modern computations of time.

I must here ask the reader's leave to refer to the tables in my Introductory volume to Ecclesiastical History, for the publication of which proposals have been issued. In that work the Olympiads have been synchronized with modern computations, as the years of Nabonassar and Philip have been in the present work. The results, therefore, which I shall now give him, may be depended upon with mathematical certainty.

Porphyry here assigns to the reign of Philip Aridæus eight years, instead of seven, as in the Canon of Ptolemy. The difference, however, is not important, and proceeds merely from their different modes of computing time, as will appear from the following calculation. According to Porphyry, Aridæus lived to the fourth year of the 115th Olympiad. That year began at the summer solstice, A. J. P. 4397, B. C. 317, and ended at the same season, A. J. P. 4398, B. C. 316. According to the Canon of Ptolemy, Aridæus reigned from E. N. 425 to 431 inclusive. This last year, as will be seen by the table, began Nov. 11, A. J. P. 4396, B. C. 318, and ended Nov. 9, A. J. P. 4397, B. C. 317. If therefore Aridæus was killed by Olympias anywhere between the summer solstice and Nov. 9th, A. J. P. 4397, B. C. 317, it is evident that the dates of the two historians perfectly correspond. Now we learn from Diodorus Siculus that Aridæus was killed four months later in the year than the death of Alexander; and as Alexander died May 22d or 23d, Aridæus must have been murdered about the 22d or 23d of September, A. J. P. 4397, B. C. 317, E. N. 431. This was not far from the end of the third month in the fourth year of the 115th Olympiad; and by counting back seven years and four months, it brings us

to the 23d of May, A. J. P. 4390, B. C. 324, as the day of Alexander's death; and this was about one month before the first year of the 114th Olympiad began. This is a surprising coincidence in the dates of the several profane historians, and gives us confidence in their accuracy.

Cassander, says Porphyry, *reigned*, including the government of Olympias, from the death of Aridæus; but his reign is *computed* as 19 years from Olym. 116, year 1, to Olym. 120, year 3. Four solid Olympiads from 116 to 119 inclusive, are 16 years. To these add three years in the 120th Olympiad, and the period from September 23, A. J. P. 4397, to the summer solstice in the next year, when the 116th Olympiad began, and it makes about nine months more; so that the reign of Cassander must be computed from Sept. 23, A. J. P. 4397, B. C. 317, to the summer solstice in A. J. P. 4417, B. C. 297, or from the close of E. N. 431, to four months before the end of E. N. 451.

Passing over the succeeding reigns, which were disorderly, till we come to the end of the Anarchy, we find that Antigonus Gonatas began to reign in the first year of Olym. 126.

The intervening period therefore extends from Olym. 120. 4 to 125. 4, both inclusive, or 21 solid years, within which the intervening reigns must be adjusted, thus :

	y. m.		from		to	
Sons of Cassander,	3 6	}	E. N. 451	E. N.	468	} First period 17 years.
Demetrius Poliorcetes,	6					
Pyrrhus, k. of Epirus,	7	}	Olym. 120. 4	Olym.	124. 4	
Lysimachus, k. of Thrace,	5 6					
Ptolemy, k. of Egypt,			A. J. P. 4417	A. J. P.	4434	
Meleager his brother,	2	}	E. N. 468	E. N.	472	} 2d period 4 years.
Antipater,	1½					
Sosthenes,	2	}	Olym. 125. 1	Olym.	125. 4	
Anarchy,	1 8½					
			A. J. P. 4434	A. J. P.	4438	
years 21						

Again, passing over the ensuing reigns until we come to the battle of Pydna, by which the Romans gained their first foot-hold in the Macedonian Empire, we are able to fix its date with precision, by the total eclipse of the moon which took place the evening before the battle,

Tuesday, June 21st, P. M., 8h. 2m., A. J. P. 4546, B.C. 168, E. N. 580 (Liv. Lib. xlv.) This was just at the close of the fourth year of the 152d Olympiad, as Porphyry states. Consequently the intervening time from the close of Olym. 125, 4, was exactly 27 solid Olympiads, or (27×4) 108 years; and the intervening reigns must be thus adjusted:—

	Y. M.	OLYM.	A. J. P.	B. C.
Antigonus Gonartas,	33 4	126 1-134 2	4438-4471	276-243
Demetrius,	10	134 2-136 4	4471-4481	243-233
Fuscus,	12	136 4-139 4	4481-4493	233-221
Philip,	42	139 4-150 2	4493-4535	221-179
Perseus,	10 8	150 2-152 4	4535-4546	179-168
Liberty under the } Romans,	19	153 1-157 3	4546-4565	168-149
Pseudo-Philip,	1	157 4 —	4565-4566	149-148

After which, the Macedonians became tributary to the Roman power.

2. THE KINGDOM OF ASIA OR SYRIA.

(*From Euseb. Chron. Arm. Ed. Ven. Tom. 1. pp. 343-358.*)

In the sixth year of Philip Aridæus, and the third year of the hundred and fifteenth Olympiad, Antigonus began to reign over Asia, and he reigned 18 years, having lived in all 86 years. He became the most formidable of all the kings in his time; and he died in Phrygia, just when all the powers, through fear, had combined to attack him, in the fourth year of the 119th Olympiad. His son, Demetrius, saved himself by flight, taking refuge in Ephesus. Being deprived of all Asia, he was thought to be the most cruel of all kings in the siege of places, whence he was called *Poliorcetes* (the besieger). He reigned 17 years, having completed 51 years of his life. Beginning from the first year of the 120th Olympiad, he reigned two years with his father, which are numbered in the 17 years of his reign. For in the fourth year of the 120th Olympiad being taken by Seleucus, he was carried prisoner into Cilicia, where, though he was kept in custody, yet he was detained in a manner befitting a king, until he died in the fourth year of the 124th Olympiad.

Lysimachus reigned in Lydia towards the parts of

Thrace; Seleucus, in the upper regions, and Syria. Both held their government in the first year of the 114th Olympiad. The matters pertaining to Lysimachus being omitted, let us proceed to relate how the affairs of Seleucus were transacted.

When Ptolemy, the first king of Egypt, had come against the ancient Gaza, he prepared for war against Demetrius, the son of Antigonus, and having conquered him, constituted Seleucus king of Syria and the upper regions. Seleucus having made an expedition against the barbarians, conquered and was proclaimed king, whence he was called *Nicanor*, i. e. conqueror. He held the kingdom 32 years, from the first year of the 117th to the fourth year of the 124th Olympiad. He lived in all 75 years, till at length by the machinations of his friend Ptolemy, surnamed Ceraunus, he was slain.

He was succeeded by his son Antiochus, born of his wife Apama, who was from Persia. He was called Soter, i. e. Saviour. He died in the first year of the 129th Olympiad, when he had lived altogether 64 years and had reigned 19, namely: from the first year of the 125th Olympiad to the third year of the 129th Olympiad.

He had the following children by Stratonice, the daughter of Demetrius; a son named Antiochus, and two daughters, Stratonica and Apama. Of these, carrying off Apama, he married her, and Demetrius, king of the Macedonians, married Stratonica. Antiochus Soter being dead, Antiochus, surnamed Theos, succeeded him in the empire, beginning from the fourth year of the 129th Olympiad. After a reign of 19 years, he died of disease at Ephesus in the third year of the 135th Olympiad, when he had lived in all 40 years. He had two sons; Seleucus, surnamed Callinicus, and Antigonus; two daughters also, by Laodice, the daughter of Achæus, one of whom Mithridates married, the other, Arathes. He was succeeded by his eldest son, Seleucus, surnamed, as we have already said, Callinicus. He began to reign in the third year of the 133d, and continued to the second year of the 138th Olympiad, having ruled the empire 21 years.

At his decease, his son Seleucus, surnamed Ceraunus,

succeeded him. In the life-time, however, of Callinicus Seleucus, his younger brother, Antigonus, unwilling to submit, made insurrection against him, being aided by Alexander the brother of Laodice, his mother, who then held the city of Sardis, and also in two engagements by the Galatæ, his auxiliaries. In Lydia, where the first battle was fought, Seleucus conquered, but he took neither Sardis nor Ephesus, because Ptolemy held the latter city. But when the second engagement took place in Cappadocia against Mithridates, two myriads (20,000) of his forces were slain by the barbarians, and he himself perished among the slain. Ptolemy, who was also called Triphon, occupied the parts of Syria; but the siege which took place at Damascus and Orthosia, was terminated in the third year of the 134th Olympiad, when Seleucus descended thither. Antigonus, the brother of Callinicus, traversed the greater Phrygia, compelling the inhabitants to pay tribute, and sending the generals of his army against Seleucus. But being betrayed to the barbarians by the ministers of his own pleasures, and freeing himself from them with only a few of his followers, he departed for Magnesia, and there on the next day he marshalled his forces by the aid of Ptolemy, conquered the rest, and married the daughter of Ziel. Nevertheless, in the fourth year of the 137th Olympiad, having twice carried the war into Lydia, he was routed, and a battle having been fought with Attalus from the region of Colva, he was forced by Attalus to escape into Thrace in the first year of the 138th Olympiad, and there died after the battle fought in Caria. Seleucus, who was called Callinicus, the brother of Antigonus, died the next year. His son Alexander succeeded him, who gave himself the name of Seleucus, but by the army was called Ceraunus. He had a brother whose name was Antiochus. Seleucus, when he had reigned after his father three years, was killed in Phrygia by the secret treachery of one Nicanor, a Galatian, about the first year of the 139th Olympiad. His brother Antiochus was substituted for him by the army, which recalled him from Babylon, and was surnamed the Great. He reigned 34 [it should be 36] years from the second year of the 139th Olympiad,

to the second year of the 148th Olympiad. In that year, having entered Susa and the upper provinces of the satraps, he was slain with his whole army in a battle with the Elamites (Persians) leaving two sons, Seleucus and Antiochus.

Seleucus succeeded his father in the third year of the 148th Olympiad, and reigning 12 years, came to the first year of the 151st Olympiad, having completed his sixtieth year. At his decease, his brother Antiochus, who was called Epiphanes, succeeded him, and reigned 11 years, from the third year of the 151st to the first year of the 154th Olympiad. While Antiochus Epiphanes was still living, his son Antiochus, called Eupator, succeeded him and reigned twelve years, his father continuing to live one year and six months under him. But Demetrius, whom his father Seleucus had given as a hostage to the Romans, escaping from Rome, repaired to Trapolis, a city of Phœnicia, slew both Lysias, the boy's guardian, and Antiochus himself, and then reigned from the fourth year of the 154th Olympiad to the fourth year of the 157th Olympiad. He was surnamed Soter, and reigned 12 years. He died in a battle for his kingdom against Alexander, who had foreign mercenaries, being excited by supplies obtained from Ptolemy, and auxiliaries from the king of Attalia.

Alexander obtained the dominion over Syria in the third year of the 157th Olympiad and possessed it five years. But in the fourth year of the 158th Olympiad, he was slain; for in the conflict with Ptolemy, the coadjutor of Demetrius the son of Demetrius, near the city of Antioch, he fell in the promiscuous throng of the battle, and Ptolemy himself was also killed. The above-named Demetrius the son of Demetrius, carried on the war; so that Demetrius the son of Seleucus, and Antiochus the son of Alexander, rushing upon one another from Syria and the city of Antioch, Demetrius conquered, and reigned in the first year of the 160th Olympiad. In the second year, collecting his forces against Arsaces, he went to Babylon and the upper regions. But the next year, which was the third of the 160th Olympiad, he was taken captive by Arsaces, who sent him into

Parthia, there to be held in custody. Hence he was called both Nicanor, i. e. conqueror, because he had conquered Antiochus the son of Alexander, and also Sidirites (Iron-bound), because he went into captivity, and was in confinement bound with chains. The younger brother of Demetrius, named Antiochus, and educated in the city of Sida, whence he was called Sidæus, when he understood that his brother Demetrius was deposed and bound in chains, went from the city of Sida, and occupied Syria in the fourth year of the 160th Olympiad. He therefore reigned nine years. This king subdued the Jews by siege, demolished the walls of their city, and cruelly put to death their choicest inhabitants in the third year of the 162d Olympiad. In the fourth year of the 162d Olympiad, Arsaces came upon him with twelve myriads (120,000 men), and used the artifice of releasing his brother Demetrius, who was in captivity, and sending him into Syria. Antiochus, though it was in the winter season, rushed upon the barbarians in a narrow place, and bravely began the fight; but he fell mortally wounded, and died in the 35th year of his age. His son Seleucus, who, though of tender age, had followed his father, was taken captive by king Arsaces, but treated with the respect due to his rank.

Antiochus had five children, three sons and two daughters. Both the daughters had the same name, and were called Laodice. Antiochus was the third child, and he and his sisters died of grief. The fourth was Seleucus, whom Arsaces took captive. The fifth was Antiochus, who is also called Cyzicus, because, being educated by the eunuch Craterus, through fear of Demetrius he took refuge in Cyzicum with Craterus and the other servants of Antiochus.

Demetrius having been set at liberty by Arsaces, began to reign again in the second year of the 162d Olympiad, after suffering a captivity of ten years. But as soon as he had returned from captivity, he turned his thoughts against the Egyptians; and when he had arrived at Pelusium, and had been met and repulsed by Ptolemy Physcus, he returned, because his soldiers hated him and were disaffected towards his government.

Ptolemy, filled with indignation because Demetrius had attacked Pelusium, sent as king of Asia, Alexander, as being the son of Alexander, that is, as if he were the son of Alexander; who being supposed to be bought by Ptolemy, received from the Syrians the appellation of Zabinas. The conflict took place near Damascus, and Demetrius, being conquered, fled to Tyre. Not being permitted to enter that city, and being on all sides smitten, and his forces scattered, he escaped on board ship in the first year of the 164th Olympiad, when he had reigned, before his captivity three years, and after his return four.

To Demetrius succeeded his son Seleucus, but on account of his mother's calumnies he forthwith died. Antiochus, his younger brother, obtained the kingdom in the second year of the 164th Olympiad; and in the third year he conquered Zabinas, who, not enduring his defeat, destroyed himself by poison. Antiochus reigned eleven years to the fourth year of the 166th Olympiad; for the one year of the reign of his brother Seleucus is counted with his. He was called Grypus, or one who has a crooked nose, and also Philometor. And because his brother by the same mother, and his brother's son on the father's side, was called Cyzicenus, of whom we have before spoken, he retired from the empire, and departed to Aspendum; whence the same person who was called Grypus and Philometor was also called Aspendus.*

After Antiochus had retired to Aspendum, Antiochus Cyzicenus reigned from the first year of the 167th Olympiad; but in the second year of the same Olympiad, Antiochus having returned from Aspendum, occupied Syria, and Cyzicenus Cœlosyria. The empire therefore being divided, Grypus held it to the fourth year of the 170th Olympiad, living after his return fifteen years; so that he reigned altogether twenty-six years: viz. eleven alone and fifteen after the empire was divided.

Cyzicenus having reigned from the first year of the

* This last sentence is very obscure, and has given great trouble to the critics. I do not know that it is correctly translated.

167th Olympiad, died in the first year of the 171st Olympiad, having reigned eighteen, and lived in all fifty years. He died in the following manner. Antiochus Grypus dying at the time before-mentioned, Seleucus his son, marching through the country with his army, subdued many cities. Antiochus Cyzicenus, bringing his forces out of Antioch, and joining battle, was conquered. Being borne by his horse among the enemy, when they were about to seize him, he killed himself with his own sword. The whole kingdom now pertaining to Seleucus, he took possession of Antioch.

But Antiochus the son of Cyzicenus made war upon him; and an engagement taking place in Cilicia, near a city called Mopsuestia, Antiochus conquered. Seleucus fleeing into the city, and asking of the inhabitants if they knew him, was told that they did know him. Whereupon, fearing lest they should burn him alive, he put himself to death. His twin brothers, Antiochus and Philip, suddenly appearing in force, and taking possession of the city, revenged their brother's death by razing it to its foundations. The son of Cyzicenus, coming upon them, conquered them in battle; and Antiochus the brother of Seleucus, driving his horse from the combat, plunged into the river Orontes and perished in its current.

There was now a strife for the kingdom between the other two; namely, between Philip the brother of Seleucus and son of Antiochus Grypus, and Antiochus the son of Antiochus Cyzicenus, beginning from the first year of the 171st Olympiad. Having well appointed forces, and being masters of different parts of Syria, they waged war for the dominion of the whole. At length Antiochus, being conquered, fled to the Parthians, and afterwards delivered himself into the hands of Pompey, that by him he might be brought back to Syria. But Pompey, seizing the treasures of the inhabitants of Antioch, cared no more for Antiochus, but permitted the city to live under its own laws.

The Alexandrians having sent Menelaus, Lampon and Calimandrus, to invite him (Antiochus) to reign over Egypt, instead of Ptolemy, the son of Dionysius, whom

they had expelled with the daughters of Ptolemy, he was taken ill and died. Philip, of whom we have now spoken, who was the son of Grypus and Tryphena, the daughter of Ptolemy the Eighth, was now released from a rival, and wished to go down into Egypt; for the Alexandrians had also sent for him to take the sovereignty. But Gabinius the Roman, who commanded Syria, as Pompey's lieutenant, prohibited him; and thus the royal succession of Syria, which had continued hitherto, was now brought to an end."

Eusebius having given this extract from Porphyry, proceeds to give a summary of the several reigns; and as this serves to correct some errors which have crept either into the original text, or the Armenian translation of Porphyry, I think it necessary to subjoin it here.

"The kings of Asia and Syria are therefore in order as follows:—

	YEARS.
I. Antigonus reigned over Asia - - - -	18
II. Demetrius Poliorcetes over the upper regions and Syria	17
III. Seleucus Nicator (the Victorious) - - -	32
IV. Antiochus Soter (the Saviour, or Deliverer) - -	19
V. Antiochus Theos, or Deus (the God) - - -	15
VI. Seleucus Callinicus (the glorious or resplendent Victor)	21
VII. Seleucus Ceraunus (the Thunderer) - - -	3
VIII. Antiochus Megas, or Magnus (the Great) - -	36
IX. Seleucus Philopator - - - - -	12
X. Antiochus Epiphanes (the Illustrious) - - -	11
XI. Antiochus his son, surnamed Eupator - - -	1½
XII. Demetrius Soter (the Saviour or Deliverer) - -	12
XIII. Alexander - - - - -	15
XIV. Demetrius, the son of Demetrius - - -	3
XV. Antiochus Sidetes (of the city of Sida) - -	9
XVI. Demetrius again - - - - -	4
XVII. Antiochus Grypus, - - - - -	26
XVIII. Antiochus Cyzicenus—Armenian years 17, Greek	18
XIX. Philippus, the son of Grypus—Arm. none. Greek	2

Under whom the Empire of Syria came to an end."

I now proceed to adjust these dates to modern computations. It has been already remarked that the different modes of computation of Ptolemy and Porphyry will account for the apparent, but not real, differences in fact. According to Ptolemy, the sixth year of Philip Aridæus was E. N. 430. That year began November 11,

A. J. P. 4395, B. C. 319, and ended Nov. 10, A. J. P. 4396, B. C. 318. According to Porphyry, Antigonus began to reign in the sixth year of Philip Aridæus, Olym. 115, y. 3. That year began at or near the summer solstice, A. J. P. 4396, B. C. 318. Consequently Antigonus began to reign after the solstice, and before November 10th. He reigned eighteen years to E. N. 448, A. J. P. 4414, B. C. 300, Olym. 119, y. 4. Therefore, he died before the summer solstice in that year, because at that time began Olym. 120, y. 1. Thus far there is no difficulty.

But with regard to the reign of his son Demetrius Poliorcetes, there is a good deal of difficulty, growing out of its turbulence, and the fact of his unsettled position. Porphyry expressly states that he reigned two years, out of the seventeen which he assigns to him in the lifetime of his father. He must, therefore, have begun to reign somewhere in Olym. 119, y. 3, or after the summer solstice, A. J. P. 4412, B. C. 302, E. N. 446. His sole reign as king of Syria began Olym. 120, y. 1, about the summer solstice, A. J. P. 4414, B. C. 300, E. N. 448. In Olym. 120, y. 4, he was taken prisoner by Seleucus. This could not have been later than the summer solstice, A. J. P. 4418, B. C. 296. This would make his associate reign, before his captivity, six years, and his sole reign four years. If he died in Olym. 124, y. 4, it could not have been earlier than the summer solstice, A. J. P. 4433, B. C. 281, when that year began. But if we count from his associate reign, we have twenty-one years, and if from his sole reign, nineteen years, to the day of his death. How, then, are the seventeen years of his reign to be computed?

Again: in Porphyry's account of the kings of Macedon, he says that Demetrius killed Alexander, the son of Cassander, some time in Olym. 121, y. 3. Supposing this to have been at the close of A. J. P. 4420, B. C. 294, which would allow to the sons of Cassander the three years and six months assigned to them by Porphyry; then Demetrius reigned six years in Macedon, from A. J. P. 4421, B. C. 293, to A. J. P. 4426, B. C. 288, inclusive. Comparing the two statements together, it would seem that Demetrius remained a prisoner with Seleucus from the summer of A. J. P. 4418, B. C. 296, to the end of A. J. P. 4420, B. C.

294, or about two years and six months. He then reigned six years in Macedon, but was expelled by Pyrrhus, king of Epirus, at the close of A. J. P. 4426, B. C. 288. We can now compute the years of his eventful life, as follows :

	YEARS.
His associate reign in Asia with his father Antigonus . . .	2
His sole reign in Asia, after his father's death	4
His first captivity with Seleucus	2 6m.
His reign in Macedon, to Olympiad 123, y. 1	6
His subsequent reign in Asia to make 15 years of sole sovereignty	2 6m.
Second captivity with Seleucus, when he was confined for life	4
	Years, 21

As the death of Antigonus, the father of Demetrius Poliorcetes, led to the greater elevation of Seleucus, it is unnecessary to go farther into the adjustment of these chronological difficulties. We turn, therefore, to the affairs of Lysimachus and Seleucus.

Both, as Porphyry tells us, held their respective governments in Olym. 114, y. 1, A. J. P. 4390, B. C. 324, when Alexander died ; not yet as kings, but as governors appointed by him. Porphyry tells us that Seleucus was made king of Syria by Ptolemy, when he came against Demetrius Poliorcetes, and that he then began to enlarge his dominions by conquest. His kingdom is dated from Olym. 117, y. 1. That year began at the new moon nearest the summer solstice, A. J. P. 4402, B. C. 312, E. N. 436. As he reigned 32 years, these are equivalent to eight solid Olympiads, and thus they complete Olym. 124, y. 4, ending at the summer solstice, A. J. P. 4434, B. C. 280, E. N. 468.

With the commencement of this reign began the famous era called the Era of the Seleucidæ. It is the era from which the years are reckoned in the first and second books of the Maccabees ; but whereas the heathen historians began to reckon from the summer solstice, the reader, if he would avoid mistakes, must always bear in mind that the author of the first book of Maccabees reckons each year as beginning with Nisan, the first ecclesiastical month of the Jews ; while the au-

thor of the second makes his to begin with the civil year of the Jews, or the autumnal month, Tisri. This era is called by the Jews the Era of Contracts, and by the Arabs Dil-Carnaim, of the two-horned, i. e. of Alexander, as the son of Jupiter Ammon. But to proceed. From Porphyry's account of the kingdom of Macedon, it appears that Lysimachus was killed by Seleucus Nicator, Olym. 124, y. 3, A. J. P. 4432, B. C. 282, soon after which Seleucus himself was killed by Ptolemy Ceraunus, who was the son of Ptolemy Lagus, and not Ptolemy Lagus himself. This event Porphyry places in the fifth month of Olym. 125, y. 1, i. e. at the close of A. J. P. 4434, B. C. 280, and not at the summer solstice of that year. These slight differences will happen when the reigns are counted in one place as current, in another, as complete years.

Antiochus Soter, therefore, the next in succession, reigned from the beginning of A. J. P. 4435, B. C. 279, the last six months of Olym. 125, y. 1, and died Olym. 129, y. 3. This year ended at the summer solstice, A. J. P. 4453, B. C. 261. This proves that he reigned only 19 current years; for 19 full years would include the first six months of Olym. 129, y. 4.

According to the Armenian text, *Antiochus Theos* reigned from Olym. 129, y. 4, to Olym. 135, y. 3, 19 years; but here there is an evident mistake; for this would make him reign at least 22 years. Eusebius gives the more correct estimate of 15 years. If he began to reign after the summer solstice A. J. P. 4453, B. C. 261, which must have been the case if we allow 18 years and 6 months to Antiochus Soter, then if he reigned 15 years, the end would be at the beginning of Olym. 133, y. 3. This would be at the summer solstice in A. J. P. 4468, B. C. 246. And this accords with what Porphyry says of the commencement of the next reign, to which we now proceed.

Seleucus Callinicus began to reign Olym. 133, y. 3, and reigned 21 years. This also means current, not complete years; for he continued to Olym. 138, y. 2. From Olym. 133, y. 3, to Olym. 138, y. 2, inclusive, is only 20 complete years. Yet Porphyry expressly says,

that Seleucus Callinicus died the year after his brother Antigonus. But Antigonus died after the battle in Caria, Olym. 138, y. 1. Consequently Callinicus died Olym. 138, y. 2. Seleucus Callinicus, notwithstanding his title of "glorious victor," was constantly unfortunate. After the death of his brother, who so perseveringly opposed him, he had nothing but trouble and misfortune to the day of his death.

His son Alexander, known in history, for the reasons assigned by Porphyry, under the names of *Seleucus Ceraunus*, reigned three years from Olym. 138, y. 3, to Olym. 139, y. 1, inclusive, A. J. P. 4488, B. C. 226, to A. J. P. 4491, B. C. 223.

After he was killed, his brother *Antiochus the Great* reigned 36 years, from Olym. 139, y. 2, A. J. P. 4491, B. C. 223, to Olym. 148, y. 2, A. J. P. 4528, B. C. 186, in which he was slain. If both these dates be included and counted as complete years, they would amount to 37 years. The number 34 in the Armenian text is evidently erroneous; and 36, the number of complete years, given afterwards by Eusebius, is correct. The extremes must be considered as current years.

Seleucus (i. e. *Seleucus Philopator*) succeeded his father, says Porphyry, Olym. 148, y. 3, and reigned 12 years, to Olym. 151, y. 1. These twelve years would extend to the end of Olym. 150, y. 4. But *Antiochus Epiphanes*, his brother, reigned 11 years from Olym. 151, y. 3, to Olym. 154, y. 1. Here there is a vacancy of two years between the *end* of the reign of *Seleucus Eupator* and the *beginning* of that of *Antiochus Epiphanes*. Porphyry records the fact, but takes no other notice of it.

There is still a greater difficulty. While Antiochus Epiphanes was still living, says Porphyry, his son Antiochus Eupator succeeded him and reigned 12 years, his father continuing to live under him one year and six months. The construction of this passage seems to imply, that after Antiochus Epiphanes had completed eleven years, he abdicated the throne in favor of his son, and continued to live after that abdication eighteen

months. Antiochus Eupator reigned during his father's life-time 1 year and 6 months, and after his father's death, 10 years and 6 months. Eusebius, on the contrary, allows but one year and six months as the whole reign of Eupator after the eleven years of his father. To reconcile this difficulty, we must examine the dates of the preceding and subsequent reigns.

Seleucus Philopator, the predecessor of Antiochus Epiphanes, reigned to the end of Olym. 150, y. 4. Demetrius Soter, the successor of Antiochus Eupator, reigned 12 years to Olym. 157, y. 4. The distance of time from Olym. 150, y. 4, to Olym. 157, y. 3, is 27 years; in which must be included the reigns of Antiochus Epiphanes, Antiochus Eupator, and Demetrius Soter, to say nothing of the interregnum of 2 years between Seleucus Philopator and Antiochus Epiphanes. But as the numbers now stand in the Armenian text, those three reigns amount to 35 years. I cannot but think, therefore, that the number of years in the reign of Antiochus Eupator should have been two and not twelve. Precisely such an error has crept into the postdiluvian chronology of Josephus as we have had occasion to observe; and with this emendation, and the insertion of the two years of interregnum, the reduction is in perfect accordance with the narrative. The interregnum lasted during the first two years of Olym. 151, A. J. P. 4538—4540, B. C. 176—174. The reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, Olym. 151, y. 3.—154, y. 1, A. J. P. 4540—4551, B. C. 174—163. The reign of Antiochus Eupator, Olym. 154, y. 2, 3, A. J. P. 4551—4553, B. C. 163—161. The reign of Demetrius Soter, Olym. 154, y. 4—157, y. 3, inclusive, A. J. P. 4553—4565, B. C. 161—149, (Inter. 2+Ant. Ep. 11+Ant. Eupat. 2+Demetrius Soter 12=27 years), Eupator therefore reigned 1y. 6m. during his father's life-time, and six months after his death. Antiochus Epiphanes was naturally desirous to settle the succession of his son, as he was a minor, during his own life-time. He therefore placed him under the guardianship of Lysias, and declared him king, and then retired from sovereignty. Shortly after his death Demetrius returned from Rome, and finding a child on the throne,

put him and his guardian Lysias to death, and declared himself king.

Alexander, having slain Demetrius Soter, reigned five years from Olym. 157, y. 4, to Olym. 158, y. 4, inclusive. The list of reigns by Eusebius gives him 15 years and not five; but that both these numbers are incorrect will on examination be evident, unless in this period of extreme turbulence and confusion, it be admitted that there was a state of anarchy after his death at the close of Olym. 158, y. 4, which lasted until Demetrius, the son of Demetrius, began to reign in the first year of the hundred and sixtieth Olympiad. This appears to me to accord with the narrative of Porphyry, and to afford the easiest clue to guide us through its intricacies.

Alexander reigned five years from Olym. 157, y. 4, A. J. P. 4565, B. C. 149, to Olym. 158, 4, A. J. P. 4570, B. C. 144. The struggle began during the last-named year between him and Demetrius, the son of Demetrius; and he was killed in battle with Ptolemy. Antiochus his son continued the war with Demetrius, from Olym. 159, y. 1, A. J. P. 4570, B. C. 144, with doubtful issues, till Olym. 159, y. 4, inclusive, A. J. P. 4574, B. C. 140. At length Demetrius, the son of Demetrius, conquered, Olym. 160, y. 1, A. J. P. 4574, B. C. 140. The next year Olym. 160, y. 2, A. J. P. 4575, B. C. 139, he went with his army to Babylon and the upper provinces, where in the following year, Olym. 160, y. 3, A. J. P. 4576—4577, B. C. 138—137, he was taken prisoner by Arsaces king of the Parthians, when he had reigned three current years.

The younger brother of Demetrius, *Antiochus Sidetes*, now assumed the sovereignty, Olym. 160, y. 4, A. J. P. 4577, B. C. 137, and reigned nine current years. He subdued the Jews and treated them with great cruelty, Olym. 162, y. 3, A. J. P. 4584, B. C. 130; but in the next year, Olym. 162, y. 4, A. J. P. 4585, B. C. 129, Arsaces came upon him with an army of 120,000 men, and Antiochus was killed in the winter of that year. This establishes the date with precision, of the termination of his reign with his life, at the age of 35, and in the winter of A. J. P. 4585, B. C. 129.

Arsaces had used the policy of liberating his prisoner

Demetrius in the second year of the 162d Olympiad, A. J. P. 4583, B. C. 131. If he was to be considered as reigning then, as the words of Porphyry imply, he was kept a prisoner not ten years as he asserts, but at the most eight; that is from Olym. 160, y. 3, A. J. P. 4576, B. C. 138 to Olym. 162, y. 2, which ended in A. J. P. 4584, B. C. 130. But if we reckon his second reign from the death of Antiochus Sidetes, the interval between the two reigns was ten years from A. J. P. 4576, B. C. 138, to A. J. P. 4586, B. C. 128.

Demetrius then began to reign the second time, A. J. P. 4586, B. C. 128, and he was conquered by Alexander Zabinas in Olym. 164, y. 1, which began A. J. P. 4590, B. C. 124, and ended A. J. P. 4591, B. C. 123; so that his second reign was full four years as stated by Porphyry.

Antiochus Gripus, the son of Demetrius, reigned eleven years from Olym. 164, y. 2, A. J. P. 4591, B. C. 123, to Olym. 166, y. 4, which ended A. J. P. 4602, B. C. 112. In this estimate is included the short reign of Seleucus, the elder son of Demetrius, which Eusebius does not notice in his list. This Antiochus, at the expiration of eleven years, retired to Aspendum, and was succeeded by *Antiochus Cyzicenus*, who began to reign Olym. 167, y. 1, A. J. P. 4602, B. C. 112. But Antiochus Gripus returned the next year, Olym. 167, y. 2, A. J. P. 4603, B. C. 111, and the empire being now divided between the two, he continued to reign 15 years longer to Olym. 170, y. 4, which began A. J. P. 4617, B. C. 97, and ended A. J. P. 4618, B. C. 96. He reigned therefore altogether 26 years, as stated by Porphyry, even omitting the year of his retirement. Antiochus Cyzicenus reigned from Olym. 167, y. 1, A. J. P. 4602, B. C. 112, to Olym. 171, y. 1, A. J. P. 4619, B. C. 95, being 17 years, as the Armenian copy reads in the list given by Eusebius.

The strife now ensued from Olym. 171, y. 1, which ended in the destruction of the Syrian monarchy two years later as stated by Eusebius, or about the end of the third year of the one hundred and seventy-first Olympiad. We may therefore place its subjugation by the Romans under Pompey and Gabinus in that year, that is, at the beginning of A. J. P. 4621, B. C. 93.

I know not whether the reader has had the patience to follow me through this tedious examination; but it was absolutely necessary to do it, in order to ascertain the certainty of many of those important dates on the accuracy of which the right interpretation of prophecy is mainly dependent. For his relief, if he has not been willing to undergo a toil far slighter than mine, I present to him the following summary of its results :

Names.	Reigns.	Olympiads.	Julian Period.	Before Christ.	Era Nabonas.
Antigonus	18.	115.3—119.4	4396—4414	318—300	430—448
Demetrius Poliorcetes	17.	119.3—	4412—	302—	446—
Seleucus Nicator	32.	117.1—124.4	4402—4434	312—280	436—468
Antiochus Soter	18. 6m.	125.1—129.3	4435—4453	279—261	469—487
Antiochus Theos	15.	129.4—133.3	4453—4468	261—246	487—502
Seleucus Callinicus	20.	133.3—138.2	4468—4488	246—226	502—522
Seleucus Ceraunus	3.	138.3—139.1	4488—4491	226—223	522—525
Antiochus Magnus	36.	139.2—148.2	4491—4527	223—187	525—561
Seleucus Philopator	12.	148.3—150.4	4527—4538	187—176	561—572
Interregnum	2.	151.1—151.2	4538—4540	176—174	572—574
Antiochus Epiphanes	11.	151.3—154.1	4540—4551	174—163	574—585
Antiochus Eupator	2.	154.2—154.3	4551—4553	163—161	585—587
Demetrius Soter	12.	154.4—157.3	4553—4565	161—149	587—599
Alexander	5.	157.4—158.4	4565—4570	149—144	599—604
Anarchy	4.	159.1—159.4	4570—4574	144—140	604—608
Demetrius son of Demetrius	3.	160.1—160.3	4574—4577	140—137	608—611
Antiochus Sidetes	9.	160.4—162.4	4577—4586	137—128	611—620
Demetrius again	4.	163.1—164.1	4586—4590	128—124	620—624
Antiochus Grypus	11.	164.2—166.4	4591—4602	123—112	625—636
Antiochus G. second time	15.	167.2—170.4	4603—4618	111—96	637—652
Antiochus Cyzicenus	17.	167.1—171.1	4602—4619	112—95	636—653
Philip, son of Ant. Grypus.	2.	171.1—171.3	4619—4621	95—93	653—655

Of the four kingdoms into which the Empire of Alexander was divided, that of Thrace founded by Lysimachus, fell an easy prey to the Romans, after they had subdued Macedon ; and as it does not particularly enter into the historical interpretation of prophecy, I have not thought it necessary to notice it any further than as it is incidentally mentioned in the preceding narratives of Porphyry. The Macedonian kingdom, as being that which the Romans first subdued : the Syrian, as that with which the Jews were most connected, and from which they suffered most ; and the Egyptian, as that which brought to our assistance the accurate calculations of astronomical science, as that which is constantly the theme of prophecy, and as that which the Romans subdued the latest ; these three kingdoms, it was necessary to describe with precision, so far as the succession of their kings and the adjustment of dates is concerned.

How well this difficult and thorny path has been cleared it is not for me to say ; but I have now accomplished all that was promised at the beginning of this Appendix. For any faults which the reader may find, I have only to plead the difficulty of the subject, and what is usually no excuse, but will entitle me to some indulgence, the necessity of writing in haste, and occasionally the absence of books which I should have found it convenient to consult. Much of this Appendix has been written at a distance from my library, in the houses of friends whom I was visiting.

I shall conclude with a summary of the principal epochs which this essay has attempted to establish, and which, when added together, will enable the reader to compute the present age of the world, so far as the nature of the subject will permit.

Epochs.	Jewish Heb. text.	Samar. Heb. text.	Septuagint Alex.	Vatic
I. From the Creation to the Deluge,	1656	1307	2242	2242
II. From the Deluge to the birth of Abraham,	352	942	942	1042
III. From the birth of Abraham to the Exodus,	505	505	505	505
IV. From the Exodus to the fourth year of Solomon, inclusive	480	480	440	440
V. From the foundation to the destruction of Solomon's Temple,	440	440	440	440
VI. From the destruction of the Temple, to the first year of the sole reign of Cyrus,	49	49	49	49
VII. From the first year of the sole reign of Cyrus, at Babylon, (which was the 70th from the establishment of the great Babylonian Monarchy, and the first captivity of the Jews when Daniel and his companions were carried to Babylon), to the death of Alexander the Great, or from B. C. 536 to B. C. 324, both inclusive,	213	213	213	213
VIII. From the accession of Philip Aridæus, to the subjugation of Egypt by the Romans, and the final subversion of the Macedonian Empire,	294	294	294	294
IX. From the beginning of the Roman or <i>fourth</i> great monarchy, by the entire subversion of the <i>third</i> , to the common Christian era,	30	30	30	30
X. From the common Christian era, to the present year, inclusive,	1843	1843	1843	1843
	5862	6103	6998	7098
The present year is therefore the year of the world, According to the Jewish-Hebrew Computation,				5862
According to the Samaritan-Hebrew Computation,				6103
According to the Alexandrian Text of the Septuagint,				6998
According to the Vatican Text of the Septuagint,				7098

ERRATA.

As the author was unable to superintend the printing, several errors have crept into this work, which the reader is requested to correct.

- P. 14, line 1, dele note * after "charity!" and insert it after "Christ!"
line 3 from top.
- p. 26, l. 19 and 22, dele the brackets.
- p. 43, l. 20 from top, dele † and insert the note to which it refers as
a part of the text at the beginning of the next paragraph.
- p. 65, l. 24, for "month of Zif," read "month Zif."
- p. 66, l. 16, for "Zin," read "Ziu."
- p. 67, l. 31, dele [version].
- p. 80, l. 26, for "(Matt. i. 2—vi. 17)," read "Matt. i. 2—17."
- p. 105, last line, for "priest's office" read "priests' office."
- p. 106, line 22, for "considering the period of time," read "consider-
ing, with Dr. Hales, the period of time."
- p. 106, l. 25, for "will be as follows," read "would be as follows."
- p. 108, l. 20, for "365" (beginning a period with numerals) read
"Three hundred and sixty-five."
- p. 109, l. 22, dele [424.]
- p. 110, 2d col. Era Nab., table, under year 16, for "Feb. 24," read
"Feb. 22."
- p. 110, 3d col. Era Nab., table, under year 64, for "Feb. 20," read
"Feb. 10."

As the arrangement of the Tables is easily seen, the reader can detect and correct, with his pen, any other mistakes which may exist.

ERRATA.

As the author was unable to superintend the printing, several errors have crept into this work, which the reader is requested to correct.

P. 14 line 1. "dark noon" after "sabbath" and insert "after" "Christ's"

P. 15 line 3. "page top"

P. 26 l. 19 and 21. "the presence"

P. 43 l. 50 from top. "date" and insert "the date to which it refers as"

"a part of the text at the beginning of the next paragraph."

P. 66 l. 24. "for" "month of Jan." read "month Jan."

P. 66 l. 18. "for" "Jan." read "Jan."

P. 67 l. 21. "date" (insertion).

P. 68 l. 20. "for" "Jan. 1" read "Jan. 1, 1844"

P. 68. "and line" "for" "and" read "and" "and"

P. 68 line 22. "for" "the period of time" read "considering"

"the" "with" "the" "the period of time"

P. 68 l. 25. "for" "will be as follows" read "would be as follows"

P. 68 l. 26. "for" "1844" (between a period with numbers) read

"Three hundred and thirty-five"

P. 69 l. 24. "date" [1844]

P. 106 2d col. "Jan. 1844" read "Jan. 1844" read

"Feb. 22"

P. 110 2d col. "the date" table under year 81. "Feb. 20" read

"Feb. 10"

As the arrangement of the Tables is easily seen, the reader can detect and correct, with his pen, any other mistakes which may exist.

CHURCHMAN'S BOOK-STORE.

JAMES A. SPARKS,

Office of the Churchman,

No. 109 NASSAU STREET, NEW-YORK,

(UP STAIRS,)

Orders, enclosing CASH, for any book to be had in this city, promptly attended to.

CHURCH MUSIC,

Adapted to the use of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and others using Chants.

RECENTLY PUBLISHED.

Gregorian and other Ecclesiastical Chants,

Adapted to the Psalter and Canticles, as they are pointed to be sung in churches. From the second London edition. This work contains: 1. The eight Gregorian Tones, with their several endings; 2. A variety of the same tones harmonized for four voices, but so as to preserve unaltered the original melodies; 3. Miscellaneous Chants; 4. Versicles and Responses, from Tallis's Cathedral Service. To which are added, KYRIE ELIESON, SANCTUS, and RESPONSES to the Decalogue. Price, 50 cents.

Canticles of the Church;

Being portions of the services which may be "*said or sung*,"—pointed and arranged in *bars* corresponding with the music to which they may be sung. The design of this work is to enable the congregation to unite with the Choir in performing this part of the service.

The following is from the Bishop of New-York ;

RECOMMENDATION.

"These volumes of '*Plain Sermons*' appear to me to be admirably adapted to the conveying of religious instruction on the sound principles of the Gospel, and are therefore recommended to the members of my Diocese, for private and family reading. I also hereby authorise the public reading of them, together with such others as I may from time to time appoint, by lay readers within said Diocese.

BENJAMIN T. ONDERDONK.

Bishop of the Diocese of New-York.

New-York, June 14th, 1841.

Rev. Dr. Jarvis's Sermons.

Just published, two Sermons, by the Rev. Dr. JARVIS:—The first on *Prophecy in General*, the second in reference to the *Doctrine of the Second Advent*. In pursuing this subject, Dr. JARVIS has been led to compile several original Chronological tables, derived chiefly from sources not generally accessible, and throwing new light on some of the difficulties of Scriptural Chronology, the publication of which will form a valuable contribution to ecclesiastical literature.

Bernard Leslie.

Just published, BERNARD LESLIE, or a Tale of the Last Ten Years.—By the Rev. W. GRESLEY, A. M. From the second London edition. Price, 75 cents.

A Treatise on Baptism,

By the late Rev. ALEXANDER HAY, of Virginia; with letters commendatory from the Rt. Rev. Bishop Chase, and the Rev. Dr. Shelton; and a Sketch of the Life of the Author, by the Rev. C. Dresser. Price, 37½ cents.

J. A. S. has constantly on sale :

The Dictionary of the Church.

Containing an Exposition of Terms, Phrases, and Subjects connected with the External Order, Sacraments, Worship, and Usages of the of the Protestant Episcopal Church, with an especial reference to the Church in the United States. By the Rev. WM. STAUNTON. Second edition, *fresh bound*. Price, \$1.12½

Tracts for the Times.

By Members of the University of Oxford. In three volumes; with which is bound, Rev. Dr. PUSEY's "*Letter to the Bishop of Oxford*," and Rev. Dr. HOOK's "*Call to Union*." Price, \$5.

JULIA OF BAILE, OR THE DAYS OF NERO. A Story of the Martyrs. Price, 75 cents.

Croswell's Prayers.

A MANUAL OF FAMILY PRAYER; adapted to the various seasons of the Ecclesiastical Year; with prayers and Thanksgivings for special occasions. By Rev. HARRY CROSWELL, D. D., Rector of the Parish of Trinity Church, New Haven.

Pusey on Baptism.

Being Part I. of Vol. II. of the Tracts for the Times. For sale separate.

ATHANASION, second edition, with Notes and Corrections. Also, Miscellaneous Poems. By the author of "*Christian Ballads*," &c.

Prayer Books.

Quarto Prayers, suitable for Reading Desks, bound; and also in sheets, which can be bound to order.

NEWMAN'S PAROCHIAL SERMONS.—This valuable work is for sale at this office. Price, \$5.

THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST, By Rev. F. D. MAURICE, A. M., from the second London ed. For sale at this office. Price, \$2 50.

Patrick, Lowth and Whitby.

A Critical Commentary and Paraphrase on the Old and New Testament and the Apocrypha, by PATRICK, LOWTH, ARNALD, WHITBY, and LOWMAN. A new edition, with the *Text printed at large*, in 4 vols. (London edition.) Price, \$25.

WORKS ON EPISCOPACY. BOWDEN and COOK. Also, Dr. COOK's Answer to the Princeton Review. For sale at this office.

J. A. S. has constantly on sale, PRAYER BOOKS of every description and style of binding, at prices varying from 25 cents upward; together with all the Standard Works of the Church. Clergymen can be supplied at reduced prices.

J. A. SPARKS, 109 Nassau Street, NEW-YORK,

Begs leave to offer his services to clergymen, and others at a distance from the New-York Book Market, to purchase books for them on the most reasonable terms, and to forward them as may be directed, to any part of the United States, or Canada.

Orders, enclosing cash, for any book in this market, or for Sunday School Libraries, will be promptly attended to.

☞ J. A. S. would refer to the Right Rev. the Bishop of New-York; the Right Rev. Bishop Chase, of Illinois; the Rev. Messrs. D.S. Lewis, St. Francisville, La.; W. D. Cairns, Columbus, Ga.; J. A. M'Kenney, Cambridge, Md.; Rev. John Coleman, D. D., Editor of the Banner of the Cross, Philadelphia; Rev. Dr. Chase, Bellows Falls, and Rev. Wm. Henry Hoyt, St. Albans, Vermont; Rev. M. P. Parks, Chaplain of the U. S. Military Academy, West Point N. Y.; J. S. F. Heald, Esq., Darien, Ga.; Rev. J. Singeltary, Washington, N. C.; B. W. Fosdick, Esq., Savannah, Ga.

J. A. S. is Agent for the following Church works: THE BANNER OF THE CROSS, weekly,—price, \$2.50 *in advance*. THE TRUE CATHOLIC, monthly,—price, \$2.50 *in advance*. A VIEW of the Organization and Order of the PRIMITIVE CHURCH, by Rev. A. B. Chapin, A. M. Price, \$1.50.

